

The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

VOL. V.

MAY 1850.

PART XXIX.

PROSPECTS OF THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC PARTY IN THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

THERE are seasons in the lives of us all which not merely influence but actually give being to our whole future destinies. Every moment, indeed, has its own definite power upon every moment that succeeds it. Not a transient thought is willingly entertained in the mind which does not leave its mark upon it, so that, in a certain sense, its results are felt even throughout eternity. But far more momentous are the consequences of those peculiar times of crisis which, at one period or other, occur in the history of every human being. By these, not only is his future life coloured, its very direction is decided. Upon them it depends whether the actual end of his existence shall be fulfilled, or whether his destiny shall be such that it would have been better for him if he had never been born.

Such also is the fate of parties. Their true tendencies and essential natures remain for a long time disguised and undeveloped. They neither know themselves, nor does the ordinary spectator of their movements know them. Whether they are sincere, or self-deceiving, or conscious hypocrites; whether they have a firm grasp of the truths they profess and put forward, or are the sport of the phrases and specious sentiments which are their watchwords; whether, in short, they are true men or false; all this remains for a while undetermined. At length a combination of circumstances arises which tests them to the quick. They find themselves unexpectedly called to decide upon some momentous question which searches them to the very depths of the soul; and according to their decision at that solitary moment their future course becomes one of victory or of contempt and rapid decay.

Such is the position of that remarkable school in the Established Church of England which has taken its stand against the vulgar Protestantism of the day, on the ground that it is a true representative of the Catholic Church of Christ, uninjured by Romish corruptions. Apart from the details of separate doctrines, they have maintained the great truth that our blessed Lord established one holy, visible Church upon earth, and that it is by the instrumentality of this Church that He not only hands on the knowledge of revealed truth to the successive generations of men, but that He also conveys that spiritual assistance without which even the Word of God itself is powerless to save the soul. This belief in the true, proper, distinct office of the sacraments as the channels of saving grace has been from the first the essential difference between the High-Church and the Low-Church schools, between the Anglo-Catholic and the Evangelical, between those who lean most upon the Prayer-book and those who glory in the Thirty-nine Articles.

The doctrine of baptismal regeneration is thus very justly felt by both parties to be the keystone of the Anglo-Catholic system. If grace be not necessarily conveyed to an infant in baptism the whole system falls to the ground; the Church is no longer, as a church, the channel of grace, for the efficacy of that very ordinance by which souls are admitted to its privileges is denied, and the sacramental and Church system is a falsehood. In a word, Anglo-Catholicism is unmingled nonsense unless the doctrine of baptismal regeneration be recognised as its first and unquestioned element. Accordingly, this doctrine has ever been the battle-field of the two contending parties. Dr. Pusey's tract on Baptism was attacked by the Evangelical school with all the energy and perseverance of which Protestantism is capable; and it was, in its substance, defended by the Oxford school as the very citadel of the Christian Church. From the first, the Low-Church party asserted that a belief in this doctrine *logically* led to a submission to the Church of Rome; whilst its defenders, though protesting against such a deduction, as loudly asserted that it was the keystone of the *true* Catholic system, as held by the Church "before the division of East and West."

And now, at length, by the direction of Divine Providence, it has come to pass that this very doctrine has been repudiated by the highest authority of the Established Church. Not on any minor point, not on any distinct question of doctrine, not on any matter of ecclesiastical discipline, but in this turning-point between the two systems, the Privy Council has decided that it is lawful in the Church of England to

deny the faith of Jesus Christ. Whatever be true as a matter of revelation—for the question tried has not been, whether baptismal regeneration was taught by our blessed Lord—this one thing is now laid down beyond all power of appeal, that the doctrine is not a matter of faith for the members of the Established Church. The Anglican Church, by her highest recognised judges, whose authority compels obedience from her Bishops and Archbishops, has in the strongest possible terms denied that she *teaches* the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. She has not forced her ministers to *deny* the doctrine: she declares it an open question, on which she has no more message from God to her children than on the subject of eclipses or the Latin subjunctive mood. As a Church, she knows nothing at all upon the whole matter; the question is of so little importance that it is not necessary for her to make any definite decree; her Articles and Prayer-book are so framed as to exclude any decision upon it; her prelates and clergy may, if they please, teach in every pulpit in the land that it is logically impossible to believe in baptismal regeneration without believing the whole creed of the Church of Rome.

Considering, further, what this doctrine is, and the position it holds in the Christian system, this decision of the Privy Council is practically a denial of the doctrine altogether. If the doctrine is not distinctly taught, it is virtually condemned. It cannot be shelved as a trifling matter of opinion. If the Anglican Church makes it an open question, she practically disowns those claims as a Church which, without this doctrine, are ridiculous. If she is in doubt whether *baptism* conveys regenerating grace, she is in doubt whether *she herself* conveys regenerating grace, for it is only by baptism that she *can* convey it. It is the very foundation of all her claims, if she is really what the Anglo-Catholics assert, and which they have hitherto declared to be the grand reason for their remaining in her body. They speak of her as “the Church of their baptism,” and now she tells them that she has no doctrine whatever on the subject of this very baptism itself. She was the channel by which they were engrafted into Christ and delivered from the wrath of God; and now her highest tribunal informs them that, whether or not they really received these unspeakable gifts through her, *she* knows nothing about it. Whether they were born of her, she cannot tell; they may be her spiritual children, or they may be foundlings. In fact, she is totally ignorant as to her own nature and office; whether she can save men’s souls, or whether they must save themselves. She enjoins them to be baptised, but what they will gain by it she cannot inform them. An infant may be brought to her for

baptism, and the clergyman who officiates may term it an edifying ceremony, while the bishop who ordained him may term it the channel of regeneration; *she* can only shrug her shoulders and profess her ignorance, and applaud both clergyman and bishop as her obedient ministers and as orthodox messengers from Almighty God to fallen man. It is only by *asserting* the doctrine of baptismal regeneration that the Anglican Church has, in the eyes of the Anglo-Catholic school, the faintest claim upon the attachment of her children. They utterly disown her rights to tyrannise over them unless she is their spiritual mother. If she is a mere national association of individual Christians, or a sect founded by a separatist from the true Church, she has no more right to their love and obedience than the Wesleyan Conference or the General Assembly of the Scottish Kirk. For her to come forward and treat them as her *subjects*, while she refuses to claim them as her *sons*, is a mixture of the despotic and the ridiculous, deserving the anger of God and the contempt of man.

Accordingly, with all the want of theological precision which belongs to Protestantism, the High-Church party have from the first *felt* that this decision must be to them a matter of life and death. Some few, more profound than the rest, have perceived that whatever were that decision it could but bring into clearer light the antichristian royal supremacy in the Established Church; but the majority have been content to anticipate an orthodox decision, regardless of the constitution of the tribunal, provided only its judgment was in their own favour. Wilfully or unconsciously shutting their eyes to the fact that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration has been denied by an immense number of their fellow-Churchmen ever since the Reformation, and flattering themselves that the Establishment is in very deed a divinely-created body and the channel of sacramental grace to their souls, they have persuaded themselves that it was impossible that the Church could actually disown so sacred a verity, or could even tolerate its denial in her authorised ministers. And now that the blow has fallen, and that Establishment for whose sake they have sacrificed so much, for whom they have resisted the arguments of Rome, have cast off their old and long-loved friends, have consented to be tyrannised over by the State and silenced by heretical bishops,—now that this very Church professes her utter unconsciousness of all maternal relationship, and coolly permits her 15,000 clergymen to say whatever they please against the institution of Jesus Christ, they can scarcely realise the position in which they are placed, or contemplate the consequences which *ought* to follow upon their previous

declarations. Whatever be the case in certain individual exceptions, this is the true state of probably many thousands of minds who are more or less under the influence of the Anglo-Catholic theory. A vague feeling of uneasiness, sorrow, and foreboding has suddenly entered into their souls; they know not where they are or what they are. Conscience pricks them, the world tempts them, the ties of blood and friendship bind them; Rome opens her arms to embrace them, but they are terrified and confounded even while most fascinated; one respected name among themselves has one theory, another has another; one person calls them restless if they speak of moving, another calls them proud if they speak of consistency, a third condemns them as enthusiastic if they hint at renouncing this world's goods; within and without all is perplexity, anxiety, and terror; in their secret souls they know that there is one and but one refuge for their aching hearts, but they cannot fly to it, they dare not, they think they should be deceived; they are restrained by old fears and ugly names; they turn their bewildered eyes over the whole Christian world, and fain would find some resting-place where a less sacrifice would be necessary, where their former conduct will be less rigorously abjured, where earthly friends will tolerate their sojourning; while still a voice whispers that awful word "ROME" in their ears, and conscience and reason together reply that if Rome be not the true home for the trembling soul, then is there *no* gospel of salvation remaining among men. Their hour is come; the hour when they must take their stand for God or for the world. The delusions of past years are vanished; she upon whose breasts they have hung and sought for nourishment has set them coldly upon the barren earth, and tells them that *she* has nought wherewith to feed them; nothing that can deceive an honest mind now remains to puzzle them or make them hesitate, the "Church of their baptism" knows nothing about baptism itself; if they now prefer to abide with her, it must be for the sake of worldly lucre, or through the ties of flesh and blood, or through fear of man, or because they have no true sense of sin, no living faith in God, in judgment, in heaven, and in hell. Their hour is come, their part must be taken; they must listen to the voice of her who has never ceased to claim them as her own because they were baptised into *her* in their infancy, or they must be content, while they possess their livings, their houses, their friends, and the applause of one another, to be trodden under foot by their fellow-countrymen of all creeds as men who dared not follow out their own convictions, and who, when the time of trial came, preferred the world to eternity.

The Anglo-Catholic school is, indeed, from this time, extinct in the nation. Its adherents can no more hold up their heads and face their fellows as honest Christian men. Its pretensions will be scouted, for it will be clear that they are not founded in sincerity, in those thoroughly *religious* convictions which make us, if need be, to be martyrs. Catholics, men of the world, Evangelicals, Dissenters, all with one voice will point to its adherents with scoffs and derision, laughing at their claims to be respected, and hearing the vain fallacies by which they strive to elude the effects of this tremendous decision as mere illustrations of the pertinacity of hypocrisy and of the boundless varieties of self-delusion by which man can persuade himself that he is serving God when he is merely following his own will. Hitherto something has been to be said for many of this school. They have been brought up to venerate the Established Church as the spouse of Jesus Christ and their loving spiritual mother. They have been kept in total ignorance of the claims of Rome, and her children, her practices, and her doctrines, have been alike misrepresented to them. They have heard little but ill spoken of those who have deserted Anglicanism for true Catholicism. Those whom they were naturally led to venerate, and whose virtues they knew, bade them love and obey the Church of England. Everything conspired to postpone any decision respecting her abstract rights. If she did not lovingly guide, and teach them, and encourage them, and was not *all* that they looked for in the Bride of Christ, at least she permitted them to love her with a child-like tenderness; she did not mock at the ordinances which they held so dear; she did not force upon them the conviction of her unworthiness, or repudiate her maternal claims. But this is so no more. The Anglican Church treats the very doctrine on which her claims on their love are based as an immaterial matter of private opinion, smiles at their uncalled-for zeal and self-devotion, and advises them to go about their business and shift for themselves—for as to sacramental grace, she knows no more about it than she knows of galvanism or electricity or any other of the mysteries of natural science. It is impossible to evade the decision of the Privy Council. It has made the claims of the Establishment as a Christian Church and the channel of grace not merely inconsistent but absolutely ludicrous. Self-deception is no longer possible for an Anglo-Catholic. The question is solely one of conscience. If he fears God and is resolved to save his own soul he must come out from that body which has formally disowned all title to his affections.

Nevertheless, this singular school is more busy than ever

with its devices, its pretences, and its "reasons." With all the outwardly seeming religiousness of the High-Church party, so few—so very few, we fear—are determined to do their duty at all costs, that too many are already prepared with some self-deluding trick of argument by which they hope to elude the destroying force of the Privy-Council decree. The most popular of these fallacies is based on the idea that the decision of the Court of Appeal is not binding upon the consciences of the established clergy because it is a lay court, and that nothing less than a convocation of the Anglican Church is competent to decide the question. The mere allegation of such a plea is sufficient proof that Church-authority and Church-government are in the *minds* of Anglicans empty sounds. Men who were familiar with the acts and decrees of a *living* Church could never be so completely the slaves of high-sounding windy phrases as to mistake so transparent a fallacy for a valid argument. They who urge this pretence forget that the question before the Privy Council was not one as to what *ought to be* the doctrine of the Anglican Church, but as to what *is*. The Council was called upon to fulfil a duty which ever was and ever must be fulfilled by the deputies of a supreme legislative authority. No other system is practicable, either in secular or spiritual things. A kingdom, whether earthly or ecclesiastical, is preserved in its integrity by a twofold power, one legislative, the other administrative. In the English realm the Sovereign and Parliament make the laws, but the judges administer them, and, with the rest of the legal profession, state what those laws, as at any time existing, really are. In the Christian Church, as a whole, the supreme legislative authority (whatever that may be) enacts the laws, declaring what is the revealed will of God, enjoining such and such doctrines to be received by the faithful, and laying down certain rules of discipline. If at any time any individual, whether bishop, priest, or layman, puts forth any opinion which is supposed to be contrary to these laws thus laid down, but which he himself asserts to be in harmony with them, the Church herself does not forthwith meet in council to decide the difficulty; her regular tribunals, ending with her ultimate court of appeal, decide the matter. Her bishops do not profess to declare what men ought to believe, or to make new laws for the Church; they simply decide what *is* the law, hearing advocates, if they please; and when the highest court has decided, the question is for ever settled. Whether the individuals who are called in as a council of advisers are laymen or ecclesiastics is, so to say, an accident. Their rights to advise do not emanate from their

own personal character, but purely from that authority which called for their opinion. So, too, a synod of bishops claims no infallibility, no power to bind men's consciences. Its office is declaratory and administrative; and if its decisions are ultimately not only legal, but infallible, it is because the highest court of appeal merges in the office of the Supreme Pontiff.

And such, if the constitution of the Anglican Church is not a confessed farce, is the office of the Court of Arches and of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. When a doubt arises as to whether any one doctrine *is* the doctrine of the Established Church, the question is first tried in the former court, and, on an appeal, is carried to the second, upon whose decision the Queen proceeds to act. The parallel between the proceedings of England and Rome is so far complete. The Anglican Church, apart from the State, makes her Articles and draws up her Liturgy, and when these are sanctioned by the Queen in Parliament they become the doctrine and laws of the Anglican Church. At the same time the same authority constitutes certain courts to administer these laws, viz. the Archbishop's Court, and above it the Queen in Council. This latter reports to the Queen what *is* the law of the Anglican Church, and upon its declaration the Queen acts; and every clergyman and prelate in the Establishment is COMPELLED to obey her Majesty's final decision or to leave the Church of England. In the same way the Catholic Church has her councils, her acts, and her decrees, which are administered by her prelates in their courts; supreme over which is the Pope, the head of the Church, whose decisions are absolutely final. No Roman Catholic ever dreams of impugning the decision of the Pope as to what *is* the law of the Church, whatever may be his personal opinion as to the infallibility of the Pope; for the whole Catholic Church in council has formally recognised the Pope as the ultimate court of appeal, and the only trustworthy exponent of the doctrines of the Church as they are. It matters not whether the Pope is infallible or not; just as in the Church of England it matters not whether the Queen is the source of jurisdiction or whether she derives her authority from a convocation: the Council of Trent has recognised the papal decision as binding, and the Anglican Church has recognised the Queen's decision as binding. The duty of all Catholics is the same, whether they be of the Gallican or the ultramontane school; they must, and they do, accept the papal interpretation of the dogmas of the Church. And the duty of all Anglicans is the same; whether they are Erastians or Puseyites, they must and do accept the

royal interpretation of the dogmas which they are bound to teach. If any Anglican clergyman now asserts that the Church of England teaches the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, he asserts a falsehood. The Church of England, by her highest court, has asserted that she does not teach it; and no honest man who possesses the *mens sana in corpore sano* will dare to allege the contrary.

That, however, they who urge this strange plea, and deny that the Queen in Council represents the Church of England, do not in many cases really believe what they say, is shewn by their efforts to obtain the establishment of some different court of appeal, which they hope will decide in their favour on the doctrine of baptism. It suits their convenience to remain in the Establishment, and therefore, for decency's sake, they agitate for a reform. Meanwhile, of course, though they will not see it, they are every hour pledging themselves to what they know to be false, and deliberately denying that the Church of England teaches the same doctrines as the Primitive Church. The difficulty is not postponed by any possible hope or prospect of a change. At this moment every one of her clergy are so absolutely bound and forced to *obey* the Queen's mandate, that, if they believe that mandate to be contrary to the word of God, they have no alternative but instantly to leave the Anglican communion. All their protesting, all their complaining, all their zeal for truth, does not alter the fact, that every moment that the Anglo-Catholic clergy are receiving their ecclesiastical revenues, they are doing so on false pretences. The crisis has *come*; the Anglican Church *has* declared herself: it is an undeniable fact that, if any clergyman were now to teach that she *does* assert that every baptised infant is regenerated, he might be brought by his bishop into the Court of Arches, and the judge of that court would instantly condemn him, and, if he refused to be silent, would forbid his ministering any longer in the Church of England. Let any Anglo-Catholic who doubts the fact, and is yet an honest man, make the trial. Let him openly preach that the Church of England *does* distinctly teach baptismal regeneration, and let him, having so done, *formally* call upon the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Archbishop of York to put him into the Court of Arches, and try the question in his case. Does any man suppose that Sir Herbert Jenner Fust or any other judge would take five minutes to give judgment against the Quixotic believer in the orthodoxy of Anglicanism? Is there a proctor or a doctor in Doctors' Commons who would give him the shadow of a hope of success? No! the land may ring with the protestations, and appeals, and reforming

schemes of High Churchmen, but is there one of them who will dare to put the matter to a really practical test, or who will prove his honesty by risking his tithes, his parsonage-house, and his worldly position against the decision of that Privy Council upon which he expends the flood of his impotent wrath?

But, even supposing it were lawful to utter falsehoods for several months or years, in the expectation of being permitted to speak the truth at the expiration of a certain period, does any one really believe that the Queen will yield up her royal supremacy, or that any new court of appeal will be established which will guide its decisions by the doctrines of the ancient Church? Has Queen Victoria shewn any signs of a wish to renounce her papal pretensions? Will the present or any future House of Commons permit the established clergy to legislate for themselves, or even to administer the ecclesiastical law independent of the Royal and Parliamentary will, so long as they retain the revenues of the Establishment? Is the prospect such as to justify a man in risking his eternal safety upon its fulfilment? Is not the bare idea of such a result beyond the limits of things to be gravely anticipated? Is any Anglo-Catholic who professes to hope for such a change believed to be sincere in his professions? Is it not clear as the noon-day that these professions are a mere self-deceiving device for stupefying the conscience and palliating the guilt of falsehood? Would any man risk a hundred pounds, or twenty pounds, or five pounds, as a wager that in five years the decision of the Privy Council will be declared *not* to be binding upon the Anglican clergy? It is humiliating to be compelled to meet such allegations with even the semblance of argument. It is like fighting a man of straw, to reason with persons who pretend to believe such manifest impossibilities. We can scarcely so far restrain our mingled indignation and scorn as to enter into serious argument with men who can unblushingly rest their claims to be orthodox Christians on such phantoms of the imagination. Let not those who make these professions talk any more of zeal, and self-denial, and humility, and love for the Fathers, and veneration for the ten Commandments; let them no longer attack the Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith only, now that they seek to be saved through Justification by Hope only; away with their cant about the "Church of their baptism," and the blessedness of humility, and the arrogance of Rome, and the holy lives of Anglo-Catholic prelates and divines, and the "signs of life" which they see in their schools and churches, and books of stolen devotions: henceforth they appear in

their true colours, as men of the world, decent, respectable, well-dressed, liberally educated, professionally correct, amiable at their fire-sides, precise in their language, and fulfilling with propriety the duties of this life; but as for being of that material of which Saints and Martyrs are fashioned,—as for being prepared to *give up* this world in order to win the next,—as for being sincere Christians and thoroughly honourable men,—it is vain to claim the glory an hour longer; they have taken their side, and neither God nor man will tolerate them more.

Meanwhile, if there is one amongst them whose heart is not merely filled with vexation but stricken with Christian fear lest he dishonour Almighty God by double-dealing, for him the path is clear. She who is his true mother has never ceased to yearn for his embrace from the first moment when he was stolen from her bosom and consigned to the hired mercies of one who has now disowned all maternal claims. Though the Anglican Church has declared that she does not walk in the steps of the Primitive Christians, there is yet a Church of Christ remaining upon earth; and the poor famishing soul is not left to wander to and fro upon a desolate world, and then to die the death of a dog. While the subjects of Anglicanism have been vainly striving to convince their mistress that she was indeed the mother of their spiritual existence, that loving Church from whom they *did* receive that regenerating grace, which is, perhaps, the only blessing they ever possessed, has been stretching forth her arms to win them back, and at this moment is knocking at the door of their hearts, and in the name of Jesus Christ bidding them open to the full tide of her pardon and her love. Why, oh! why will they still make themselves strange to her? Do they not know that the Church of Rome, while she disclaims all jurisdiction over the unbaptised, regards every man who has been validly baptised* as *her child*, though now disobedient? If they have grown up separate from her visible communion through purely unavoidable ignorance, and have not by any mortal sin forfeited the blessings of regenerating grace, she regards them as really living members of the *Roman Catholic Church*, though they may think themselves members of some

* For the information of our non-Catholic readers, it may be worth while stating that the Church of Rome regards every baptism as valid in which the person baptising pours water upon the head (that is, not merely upon the hair) of the person baptised, repeating *at the same time* the words, "I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and having also the intention to do by that act whatever our Lord Jesus Christ enjoined when He instituted the sacrament of baptism. Such a baptism is valid, even though the person baptising be a Protestant of any kind, a man, a woman, or a child.

Protestant community. Never for one moment has she disowned them, even though they have disowned her. Never has she viewed them in any other light than as her own spiritual offspring, though stolen from her after their new birth. She loves them with all and more than all the ardent tenderness with which an earthly mother clings to the memory of a child whom she has lost in its infancy, and who has passed all its after life among heartless strangers, who have exacted from it obedience while they gave it no affection. She would as soon think of denying the Divinity of her Lord and the atonement by which we are saved as of renouncing her maternal claim to the affection and service of *every* baptised person, however estranged his heart and bitter his ignorant malice against her from whom he derived his spiritual being. "Can a woman forget her infant, so as not to have pity on the son of her womb?" Yes, of a truth the natural mother may turn from her own flesh and blood, even as the Anglican Church has nought but riches and chains for those who call themselves her sons; but she, in whom resides that Lord of mercy who can never forget his creatures, will never forsake one soul of all those millions who in their infancy receive their new-birth through her invisible power, though they repay her love with mockings and insults, and in their delusion would fain be guilty of the crime of matricide.

Little indeed does the Protestant world know of the true impulses which lead Catholics to strive so ceaselessly to win Protestants back to the fold of Christ. They imagine that it is party-spirit which moves us, that we are wild after gaining "proselytes," that we yearn for a despotic spiritual and temporal dominion, that our chief principle is a hatred of Protestantism, that we pant for the revenues which once were ours, that we are eager for the glory of making "converts." They forget what it is that *we* mean by a "convert," and that the only "conversion" we care for is such a conversion of the soul to the love and fear of Almighty God as shall open a man's eyes to the snares of Protestantism and bring him to the feet of his Lord where alone that Lord is to be found. They fancy us a vast, well-disciplined army, banded together by some sort of worldly ties, marshalled under our stern commanders, and sent forth to battle with our fellow-creatures, and to drag them by every means, fair or foul, to join our own *party*. Little do they know that the only bands which bind us are the cords of love, and that it is a desire for the salvation of our friends and fellow-countrymen and for the glory of God which impels us to rest neither night nor day till we have—not, as they say, brought them *over to*, but—brought

them *out* from darkness to light, from sin to holiness, from slavery to freedom. Such, indeed, are our desires for every human being alive, Jew, Turk, infidel, or heretic; but most especially is it our feeling towards those who, naming the name of Christ and not rejecting all his sacraments, baptise their children in their infancy with a valid baptism. Especially upon those who, coming of parents of the Anglo-Catholic school, are doubtless generally validly baptised,—upon these we have a double claim, and we feel a double interest in their welfare. We yearn for their souls as the souls of our brothers in Christ, though, like the prodigal son, they have spent the best years of their life in a foreign land. Unlike that elder brother in the parable, who murmured when the repentant prodigal was welcomed with joy and feasting, we rejoice over their return to the home of their infancy, to the Father of their salvation, and the Mother of their new birth. With reluctant hand the Church indeed repeats their baptism with a conditional form of words, because unhappily, and this *on their own testimony*, the sacrament is sometimes so ignorantly administered by Protestants as to be rendered valueless; and as it is generally impossible to ascertain what has been the fact in any individual case, it is the usual practice of the Church to baptise conditionally all who come to her. This the Church of Rome does, *because she believes in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration*. But still, as a matter of probability, there can be no doubt that an immense number of children in the Established Church are really regenerated in baptism, and therefore we cannot but love them in some sense as fellow-Christians, and speak to them with a more confident hope of being understood than if they were undoubtedly the unregenerate offspring of Heathenism.

And most of all does this fraternal regard arouse those who have themselves been converted from Protestantism to seek to win their still-wandering brothers to their only true home. The sincere Anglo-Catholic may be assured that those who have already renounced that system to which he still clings are among the most zealous for his conversion, not from a vulgar abhorrence of Protestantism, but from a peculiar affection for those whom they have left behind. It is commonly said that the zeal of converts is proverbial, and that this zeal is a mere natural reaction of the mind against that party which they have forsaken. And, doubtless, converts to the Catholic Church are as liable to the infirmities of bad human nature as other men, and are as far as possible from professing to be free from any taint of those lower motives which mingle with the actions of all but the perfected saint.

But it is a groundless error to suppose that any such inferior or unworthy motives are the moving principle of those converts who strive for the conversion of their former fellows. They strive for it and pray for it, because they know by experience what it is to be a Protestant, even of the best sort, and what it is to be a Catholic; because they sympathise with those who are still unconvinced, and appreciate the difficulties that surround them, and give them credit for sincerity when most men would think them conscious hypocrites; because they have learnt that all their own prejudices about the Church of Rome were the effects of long-standing ignorance, and that it is really impossible even to comprehend her doctrines and system until the mind is within her fold, and practically obeys and loves her. If they cry aloud, and utter strong and harsh expressions, and describe in bitter terms those practices and opinions which once they held sacred, it is because they have acquired so vivid a perception of their intrinsic hollowness and soul-destroying tendencies that they cannot restrain the spirit within them, or always adopt the most conciliatory and cautious course of action. They denounce Anglicanism in every shape, because they have discovered its deceptions, and because they have learnt what it is to fly to the embrace of the true Mother of the soul; but it is from honest, hearty, friendly, brotherly love for *Anglicans* that they shew no forbearance towards the theory which enthralled them, or towards that gigantic Establishment which has nothing but husks with which to feed its slaves.

To every Anglo-Catholic, then, who is now staggered, bewildered, and terrified by this recent decision of the Privy Council, we say, You have hitherto yielded to the Church of England a willing love and obedience, because you accounted her the channel of grace to your souls. You respected her, and rejoiced in her ordinances, because you thought yourselves regenerated through her act. You have accounted her the "Church of your baptism," and have repudiated all thought of deserting her, because you believed her to be your spiritual mother, at once the instrument of your salvation and the voice of God proclaiming to you your mysterious privileges, and shewing you what you must do to be saved. Now at last your eyes are opened, and this Church solemnly and distinctly disclaims the sacred relationship. She does not positively deny that you were regenerated by the baptism which she gave you; but of so little moment does she esteem the subject, that she tells you that you may believe just what you please respecting that sacrament of your new birth. If you choose, in the exercise of your own free will, to look

upon her as your spiritual mother through baptism, well and good ; she is happy enough to receive your *obedience* on any hypothesis. But if you deride the whole notion of a new birth derived from her as the channel of God's grace, well and good also ; *she* makes no claim to be your mother, she only wishes to be your ruler. Whether or not you were regenerated by baptism, and so made her children, she assures you is a mere question of curious speculation, not of divine revelation and of fact. Your love, your enthusiasm, your heroic determination to stand by her unto death, are all very pleasing romantic refinements of sentiment, which you are perfectly welcome to entertain, if so it pleases you ; but *she* is too practical, too sensible, too Protestant, to hamper herself with any such subtleties of feeling. She is a Church made for working, for the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries ; she is an Establishment, and must not pledge herself to any thing that may be inconvenient ; she is *judicious*, like the great Richard Hooker. Such is her practical recommendation to you, and such the freezing consolation she gives you in your misery.

And while she thus complacently puts by her maternal title, another stands by, with sad and loving gaze watching you, praying for you, and longing for the hour when you will recognise in her your true and only mother, who gave you that birth you have been wont to attribute to another parent, and who, amidst all your blinded rebellion, has never ceased to claim you and to love you as her own. If you *were* regenerated in baptism, if the sacrament of our blessed Lord was not made of none effect through the ignorance or evil intention of its administrators, if in your infancy you were made children of God, and brothers of Jesus Christ, and inheritors of heaven, it was by virtue of *her* faith, *her* power, *her* Lord and Master. Jesus Christ gave you to her, and to her alone, to nurse, and to feed, and to educate to spiritual manhood. Though you have known it not, you were made her children, and from her sacred body flowed forth every grace that has ever been yours. If in your earliest childhood you lived as pious Christian children, strong in your faith in God and Christ, while your elders were gone back to the world's deadness and unbelief ; if as you advanced to maturity a mighty and invisible hand was long time with you, restraining you from sin, cooling the fires of youth, and carrying the Word of God home into the depths of your souls ; if for years and years you were free from mortal sin, while through invincible ignorance you lived apart from your true mother's embrace ; if now that ignorance is still the fruit of circumstances alone, and you have never willingly shut

your eyes to the truth, and have been preserved from quite falling back into the service of Satan; if a voice still pleads with you, and whispers that glorious, awful word ROME in your trembling ears, while your heart responds with a scarce conscious quickening of its pulsations, and you feel yourselves drawn, at once willingly and anxiously, to one whom you love in secret notwithstanding all your terrors; if at this moment you are daily crying to Almighty God, "Lord, save me!" like Peter when he walked on the water to go to Jesus;—all this is the fruit of your new birth *into* that one Church of Rome, who is not only the mother and mistress of all churches, but the mother and mistress of your souls. You know not her, but she knows you. You shudder and fly when she bids you run to her arms, but she watches you still, and forgets not the children of her love. She is mysterious and awful to your trembling sight; but would she be the representative of the Almighty God if she were *not* mysterious and awful? "All the glory of the King's daughter is *from within*," even as the glory of the King Himself is a life-giving radiance to his children and a consuming fire to his foes. None but those who love God can comprehend Him; and none but those who love his Church, the Church of Rome, can comprehend her.

Why will you not take counsel from those who have long since made trial of her power and virtue, and fled from that communion which they discovered to be no mother to them? Ask them what Rome has been to their souls; whether she is a tyrant, superstitious, enslaving, loving ignorance and cruelty, deceitful, dishonouring God through overmuch worship of his saints;—ask them whether she has not satisfied their utmost desires—at once humbling and elevating them, filling them with penitence and with joy, and proving herself in very deed the instrument employed by God for their salvation. They will tell you that in proportion as they have yielded her a more unquestioning, loving, and filial *obedience*, so they have found her truly *maternal* office more abundantly made clear. The more simply they serve God in an exact following of her direction, the more marvellously does the filial character of their relationship display itself. Grace, in her, is an inexhaustible fountain. When it flows in a scanty stream, it is because they seek it grudgingly and hesitatingly; when they give all that they have, and all that they are, to her service, they are inebriated with the torrent of new wine that gushes forth into their hearts.

Why are they to be treated as deceivers, as rash and headstrong men, whose words are of no worth, and whose

testimony is untrue? *Why* should they deceive their ancient friends? Why, if they have been themselves deceived, and have found themselves in the chains of a tyrant when they expected the embraces of a mother, why should they continue willingly in their bondage, and devote their whole lives to bring others to share their misery? Are they *all* enthusiasts, *all* rash, *all* proud, *all* foolish, *all* incompetent judges, *all* governed by party spirit? It is impossible. And yet they all agree in their testimony. One says one thing, and another another. Individuals retain their natural characters. Each has his faults as well as his virtues. Each has his own favourite arguments, and rests most upon the proofs that are to himself the most convincing. Each has his own cherished devotions, and is peculiarly attached to some one or other of the holy works of the Catholic Church. But in two things they all agree; they all have found the Church of Rome far different in reality and within from what they expected to find her; and whatever were their anticipations of the various relations she would assume to their souls, they have found that a mother's love is the ruling power over all.

THE LIFE OF FREDERIC HURTER,

AUTHOR OF THE LIFE OF POPE INNOCENT III.

From the French of A. St. Cheron.

[Concluded from p. 335.]

CHAPTER IV.

Hurter's visit to Rome—His stay at Pavia—Impression produced by the relics of St. Augustin—His arrival at Rome—Audience with the Holy Father—Last struggles—Conversion—Abjuration—Baptism and first Communion.

IN the June of last year, when the translation of *An Account of the Institutions and Customs of the Church in the Middle Age* was published, I concluded the preface in these words: "God, we doubt not, will open the treasures of his mercy (as we with all our heart entreat Him to do) upon him who has laboured, struggled, and suffered in defence of the Church; and this grateful Church will have the happiness of receiving him into the number of her most faithful, most beloved, and glorious children."

Twelve months after, almost on the very day, this wish was realised, and the Church gained another son. On the 29th of February, 1844, Hurter set out for Rome, and while

at Pavia he felt a most longing desire to see the famous relics of St. Augustin. "Sometimes," says Bossuet, "God inspires sinners with certain remote dispositions which, when carried out into action, end in their conversion." The body of St. Augustin, which was kept securely locked up, not being exposed to the veneration of the faithful, except on certain solemnities, Hurter met with some difficulties; but God, who had reserved for this great bishop the honour of giving a decisive blow to his heart, removed all obstacles; for scarcely had he come in presence of St. Augustin's body, when a strong emotion came over the mind of our traveller; the brightness of an internal light dissipated the clouds which still hid from him the truth, and he felt ready to embrace it. This, however, was but a preparation.

After his arrival at Rome, Hurter was deeply moved by all that he saw in that noble city. The beautiful and affecting history of Catholicism and apostolical tradition were brought before his eyes in those institutions and monuments so well described in that recent work of the Abbé Gerbet, which forms a sublime epic poem.* Hurter became acquainted with persons of distinction, and throughout the Lent and the Month of Mary regularly attended the sermons of the learned religious Ventura. Several times those with whom he was staying noticed that he was much affected when he came back. He was likewise greatly touched by the majesty of the Catholic worship. Nevertheless, he was on the point of leaving without manifesting any internal change; he was about to return to Germany, though with the intention of one day revisiting Rome and accomplishing what his heart desired. Before his departure he wished to be presented to the sovereign Pontiff, and was strongly affected by these words, so like those of a father: "When," asked the Pope, "shall I be able to call you my son?" "One day," replied Hurter. But he departed:—who can answer for the future? that future of which God alone, who almost always punishes severely those who slight his grace, is the master.

The last struggles took place in Hurter's heart. The devil clung so much the more violently to his prey as God seemed to redouble the motion of his grace to effect the deliverance of this poor soul. How well did the great saint, whose sacred relics Hurter had lately beheld, understand, and describe in moving and energetic language, the distress, the tortures, the groans, and struggles of the heart under the final effort of triumphant truth:—

* *Esquisse de Rome Chrétienne.*

"Thus did I suffer, and thus was I tortured; accusing myself with unusual bitterness, twisting and rolling in my bonds, until I had entirely burst that chain which held me only with a feeble link. Thou, O Lord, didst urge me on in the recesses of my heart, and thy merciful severity scourged me with repeated blows both of fear and of shame . . . for I said within myself, 'Forward, forward; no more delay:' and my heart was in union with my words. I was on the point of doing something, yet I did it not. Then did I strive, and was but a hair's breadth from reaching the object of my desires, and attaining and holding it; still I held it not, nor even touched or came near to it; uncertain whether to die or to live, I allowed myself to be governed by evil, the companion of my childhood, rather than by that which was better, to which I was a stranger. The nearer I approached that ever-vanishing moment, when my very being was to undergo a change, the more panic-stricken I became; neither brought back nor taken away, my steps were suspended."*

At length, during the anxieties of this terrible struggle, Hurter exclaimed in the words of Fenelon: "O Being infinitely perfect! if Thou art truly so, and knowest the desires of my heart, shew Thyself to me; remove the veil which hides thy face from me; preserve me from the danger of not knowing Thee, of wandering far from Thee, and of losing myself amidst vain thoughts in my search after Thee. O Truth! O Wisdom! O Goodness Supreme! if it be true that Thou art what Thou art said to be, and that Thou made me for Thyself, suffer me not to belong to myself, but to Thee, whose work I am. Let me behold Thee; shew Thyself to Thy creature."*

When that night of anguish was over which followed the day of his audience of the Holy Father, Hurter arose with a great calmness and serenity, which every one remarked to be unusual since his stay in Rome, though formerly they were habitually on his mild and agreeable German countenance. The next morning he hastened to a Swiss ecclesiastic, a friend of his, who was chaplain in the Pope's palace, and said to him: "I have made up my mind; do me the favour of going to the Holy Father, to know his pleasure on the subject of my abjuration, which I am desirous should take place as soon as possible." The Pope assigned the next day but one, and appointed Cardinal Ostini to receive his abjuration.

On the 21st of June, the feast of St. Lewis of Gonzaga, Hurter received baptism and confirmation in the room which

* Conf. liv. viii. ch. xi.

† Lettre 1^{re} sur divers sujets de Métaphysique et de Religion.

was formerly occupied in the Roman College by that angelical youth. Dr. Wihmann, who, twenty-one years before, on the same day, and in the same room, had made his abjuration, stood as a sponsor to our new convert. Hurter then went down to the church of St. Ignatius, where, for the first time, he received the holy communion, in company with from 1100 to 1200 of the students of the college. "I will not attempt," says an eye-witness, "to describe the feelings of the assembly attracted by that festival, when they saw this celebrated Protestant doctor humbly submitting his reason to sublime and holy mysteries, and in the midst of these youths bowing down his head, grey with age and meditation. After communion, our new convert, who till then had remained outside the balustrade, was introduced into the sanctuary, and knelt before a *prie-dieu*. It was then that I was edified with his profound recollection, as I was yesterday with the joy with which he spoke to us of the great favours which God had just bestowed upon him. We went, in company with Father Ventura, to pay him a visit in the apartment which he occupied in the Quirinal, near his fellow-countryman and friend Monseigneur Custen, almoner of the Swiss. With tears in his eyes he embraced us; and when we begged him to favour us with some of his own handwriting, he inscribed these words, 'Grace is all-powerful,' with the date, June 20, 1844, and his signature, Dr. Hurter." In order to complete this description, I publish the letter which was written at Rome on the very day of the ceremony by the Abbé H. de Bonnechose, one of the converts and disciples of the Abbé Bautain, now one of our most distinguished preachers. It will be observed that Providence seems ever pleased to associate France, by means of some of her worthiest representatives, with all the most remarkable receptions into the Church which occur at Rome. It is still fresh in our memories, that the Abbé Dupanloup was one of the witnesses and the eloquent orator at the abjuration of Maria Alphonsus Ratisbonne. The following is M. H. de Bonnechose's letter, which has been already published in the *Univers*:

Rome, June 21, 1844.

My dear friend,—I have just been present at a most affecting solemnity, and my mind is still filled with the impression I received. The illustrious biographer of Innocent III., Hurter, with his hoary locks, made his first communion to-day, in company with the Roman youth who assembled in the spacious church of St. Ignatius to celebrate the feast of St. Lewis of Gonzaga. You recollect how his complete conversion was desired; how near it appeared to be, and yet how

it was deferred. At length God darted his last ray of grace into the heart which awaited it; and this decisive grace was given at Rome. It does not become me to make known the details, which belong to Hurter alone, and which I believe he intends shortly to publish.

I will only mention, that, on his arrival in Italy, he went to Pavia for the purpose of seeing the body of St. Augustin. Objections were made at first, but, having overcome these, he soon found himself in presence of the holy relics of the Bishop of Hippo. There issued from them, as it were, a sudden light, which dissipated the darkness of the doubts and prejudices in which he was still enveloped. The scales fell from his eyes, and the sublime embodiment of Catholic truths appeared to him in all their divine splendour and unity. His mind was convinced, but his will remained weak. Being shortly after introduced to the sovereign Pontiff, who asked him when he might number him amongst his children, Hurter made answer in an hesitating tone, and put off till the following year the fulfilment of the resolution which he had made in his heart. However, a friendly voice, the voice of a religious and priest famed throughout Rome for his eloquence and piety, recalled to his mind these words of the holy Bible, "Delay not to be converted to the Lord, and defer it not from day to day" (Ecclus. v. 8). He told him that little dependence was to be placed on the future, and that truth once discovered must be embraced and confessed. Hurter, much affected, then left him, and on the morrow had information conveyed to the common Father of the faithful that he was desirous to be called one of his children, and that he was prepared to make his abjuration. Cardinal Ostini was appointed to receive it, and the preparation was soon made, for during thirty years it had been going on. It has been said by the most august lips in the world, that Hurter, in this important case, was not a catechumen but an apologist. Two days ago the abjuration was made, and to-day all was ready for the communion. The spacious nave of the church of St. Ignatius was most magnificently ornamented in honour of St. Lewis of Gonzaga, around whose virginal tomb the faithful prayed in silence. The students of the German College, of the Roman College, and an immense number of youths from other educational establishments, and of every grade, occupied the open space between the entrance and the sanctuary. Here did the venerable Cardinal Ostini celebrate the holy sacrifice, and here, alone and on his knees before the communion-table, between the altar and the close ranks of the youths who filled the edifice, might be seen the aged patriarch of the

council of Schaffhausen, the historian and apologist of Innocent III. I had the good fortune to place myself at the foot of one of the pillars in the choir, where I could fix alternately my eyes upon the altar and Hurter buried in deep meditation. Tears fell abundantly from my eyes. How shall I describe all this spectacle! You should have been present in order to understand that interior joy so deep and solemn with which we were filled by the presence of God, manifesting, by these wonders ever new, the youth and fruitfulness of his Church. How long a time has He waited for this soul! How many ways has He prepared for him! How He has assisted him to break through the thick darkness which environed him from his cradle! And now behold this venerable old man receiving his God in company with young Levites, with children who had scarcely passed the threshold of life! O Lewis of Gonzaga! O Innocent, supreme Pontiff! what looks of complacency did you not cast upon this glorious conquest of the Church, and what smiles at her triumph! As for myself, in my admiration of the ways of Providence, in rendering this upright soul a captive to the sweet yoke of truth, I involuntarily applied these words to that day's office: "The Lord conducted the just through the right ways, and shewed him the kingdom of God, and gave him the knowledge of the holy things, made him honourable in his labours, and accomplished his labours" (Wis. x. 10). Yes, Hurter's soul was upright, and God hath conducted him by the hand, and hath shewn him his kingdom on earth, which is the Church of Christ, and the chair of Peter, where He sits and speaks and reigns in the person of his vicar. In spite of a false education, He hath given him understanding and a knowledge of his doctrine and divine mysteries. Finally, He hath inspired him to undertake a labour whose object was to render homage to a misrepresented Church, and to justify a calumniated Pontiff: labours which He hath blessed with life, and made to produce immortal fruits. "He hath made him honourable in his labours, and accomplished his labours."

Overflowing with joy, I wished to share it with you; and therefore I had scarcely returned home when I hastened to write these few lines, which I beg you to accept as another proof of my esteem and affection.

H. DE BONNECHOSE, *Apostolic Missionary.*

It was not without a special design of Providence that Hurter was conducted to the capital of Christendom to make his solemn abjuration; for if it was just that the learned historian, who restored the fair fame and glory of the Papacy in

the person of one of its most illustrious representatives, should in Rome be admitted to the grace of reconciliation, it was likewise just that the honour and joy which accompanied this great triumph should be reserved for that Church which is the object against which so many writers who are opposed to Catholicism direct their attacks. Finally, if the ceremonies of Hurter's abjuration, baptism, and first communion, were performed in an establishment of Jesuits, in the church of St. Ignatius, and on the feasts of St. Francis Regis and St. Lewis Gonzaga, it was just that such a consolation should have been reserved to the holy and renowned company of Jesus, appointed by God from its very foundation to be exposed to insult, calumny, and violence from those who seek to weaken, enthrall, and ruin the Catholic Church.

CHAPTER V.

Hurter returns to Switzerland—Rise of the Protestant population—Hurter's address to his fellow-citizens.

When Bossuet heard of Lord Perth's conversion, he wrote to him as follows: "Your conversion has filled heaven and earth with joy, and I cannot tell how many pious souls have shed tears on your account; for it is evident that this is the work of God's hand." This was not the only resemblance between Hurter and the illustrious Anglican convert; for the furious populace attacked Lord Perth's hotel, and pillaged and burnt all that came within their reach. In the same manner the populace of Schaffhausen, according to their ideas of liberty of conscience, were determined to imitate the proceedings of their fellow-Protestants of the 17th century. The report of Hurter's return having been spread throughout Schaffhausen, July 15, 1844, an immense crowd made towards his house, uttering loud threats. However, as they soon heard that he had retired to the abbey of Rheinau, the immense crowd dispersed amidst shouts of "Down with the Jesuit!" and "Liberty for ever!" Thence, they presented themselves before the house of Professor Zehnder, a man well known as a Protestant Radical, whom they cheered. This popular fury manifested itself with still greater violence on the night of the 16th, which caused a proclamation to be issued by the town-council, who attributed the two outbreaks to a number of strangers and students. In case of their repetition, the council made known their intention of ordering troops from Klettgau to occupy the town. The report of these shameful insults

to his family having reached Hurter in his retreat, he published in the *Church Gazette* the following declaration, addressed to his fellow-citizens :

“ On the 19th of this month (July 1844), during my stay at St. Gall, I was sensibly affected by the report of the attack made upon my family ; when I not only figured to myself the dangers to which they were exposed, but I was grieved at the injury inflicted on the fair fame of my fellow-citizens by a few rebels and ignorant persons, in company with students and strangers. Yes ; such behaviour as this I considered as an attack against the good name of a town for whose honour and prosperity I have laboured much. Not satisfied with offering this insult to my wife and children, they went so far as to insult in a most gross manner my brothers, who, as it would not be difficult to prove, were entirely ignorant of my intention to enter the pale of the Catholic Church, and had never exercised any influence on my resolve. If there is any one who is desirous to know my reasons for entering the Catholic Church, I am prepared, with the Apostle, to tell them, and give an account of the faith which is in me. To have resisted God’s will and the inspirations which for the period of four years He had favoured me with, would have been the highest pride on my part. Moreover, being accustomed to give my opinion on every question and under every circumstance in an open manner, regardless of human respect, even when I ran the risk of injuring myself, I would not have demeaned myself so low as to conceal the deep conviction which had ripened in my soul, or appear different in the eyes of the world from what I am in reality. I would have spurned the idea of concealing within my own breast that which can only acquire its value by being published to the world as the only conduct worthy of a Christian. It was not the wisdom of man which dictated these words : ‘ He who shall confess Me before men, him will I confess before my Father.’ Yet, if I wish to speak on this subject according to the language of men, I could insist, like others, upon exercising that liberty which is said to be the supreme and unalterable right of our nature, especially in a matter like this, where man can be responsible only to God, and where no human authority should have sway over him.”

In laying before you, dear reader, the conversion and trials of our new brother, I seek our mutual edification by recalling to your mind the words of those immortal geniuses who have clothed heavenly thoughts in such eloquent terms. Allow me, therefore, to repeat and apply to our dear and illustrious convert those beautiful words of Bossuet, when he speaks of the happiness of converts who suffer for Jesus Christ :

“Bear your sufferings for the love of holy Church; for if the favour which God has bestowed upon you, of being brought to the one faith, was not accompanied with some loss, it would not appear so precious in your eyes. Unite yourself in spirit to the happy company of those who have suffered for the truth, and who have washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb without spot. As often as you are in trouble and affliction, and shed tears, after having embraced the faith, so often do you wash yourself in the blood of your Saviour Jesus, so often do you wipe out your sins, and come out of that sacred bath with immortal beauty.”*

With regard to ourselves, as French Catholics, I will say with Bossuet, writing to Lord Perth, “May the Holy Spirit send down his abundant graces upon the Catholics amongst whom you live; that they may not imagine that to stand courageously by their religion is all that is required; but that, according to the example which you, my Lord, have set them, they may shew their faith by good works, and that they may learn from you to respect apostolical institutions and the holy hierarchy of the Church.”†

Have not the courage, equanimity, and resignation with which Hurter has borne the trials above mentioned, merited for him that eulogium which Bourdaloue once made upon some new converts?

“When we consider the zeal of certain converted sinners, the progress which they make in the ways of God, and the intercourse which they have with God, it would appear enough, says St. Augustine, to excite the jealousy of the most pious, and almost make them complain to God as did the elder brother of the prodigal son to his father, but that they are more interested for God than for themselves. O wonderful effect of repentance, which is able in some sort not only to put the sinner on a level with the innocent but even to raise him above them! It is in this sense, and literally, that, according to the expression of the Gospel, the angels rejoice over the conversion of one sinner more than over the perseverance of ninety-nine just.”‡

* Sermon on Charity to new Converts.

† Miscellaneous Letters, cxxiv.

‡ Sermon on the Conversion of Magdalen.

CHAPTER VI.

Hurter's letter to the author — Statement of the motives which led to his conversion.

A few days after the disturbances which took place in his native town, Hurter did me the honour of addressing to me the following letter :

Sir,—Very frequently whilst at Rome, and especially on the day of my reception into the Church, I thought of you and all my other friends in Paris ; pictured to myself what great interest you and so many other Catholics in heart and soul would take in the news of my conversion ; I fancied in my own mind with what joy you would be filled. Although neither yourself, nor any of those whose acquaintance I had the happiness to make in Paris the preceding year, could be present at the ceremony of my abjuration, nevertheless France was represented there, particularly by the Abbé Gerbet, and M. Mecieux, grand vicar of the diocese of Digne. The congratulations which I received from the representatives of your country did not, however, make me forget the feelings of so many distinguished persons and friends, known and unknown, who have expressed sincere wishes for my salvation. All, and the Holy Father in the first place, observed that my entrance into the fold of the Church might be regarded as the reward of my conscientious labours. I send you some particulars on the motives of my conversion. This will shew you that the Divine grace removed the obstacle which I feared the most, and which at first appeared to me the most insurmountable ; I mean, the voluntary consent of my wife. From the first, her opposition was very slight, but in the end she warmly approved of my resolution.

The lower classes, being irritated and excited against me by the press and by certain Pietists, made an attempt to prove, by a furious *charivari* and other excesses, that I had betrayed my religion and the town. These proceedings were repeated for two evenings, and in such a manner that not only the police but the government were obliged to take serious measures of repression. While these things were taking place, I was in quiet retirement at Inspruck, a fact which shews that these attacks were directed only against my wife and family. Instead of reproaching me with these disorders, my wife spoke of them with the most perfect tranquillity, and even the most imperturbable serenity. In this I see cause for rejoicing, in this I behold the grace of God already operating in my wife's soul ; and I trust that it will complete what is already begun.

Yielding to her advice, and that of my brother, I stayed for the first few days in Rheinau Abbey, whence I issued my address to my fellow-townsmen. A few days after I returned to town; I passed and repassed through the streets without being annoyed or insulted, or less respected than before.

As, according to the expression of Cardinal Micara, the young man who receives the priesthood signs his death-warrant, so he who enters the Church ought to be prepared to undergo tribulation. *Omnes qui pie volunt vivere in Christo Jesu, persecutionem patientur*, says St. Paul; but resignation together with the prayers of the true members of the Church supply a supernatural degree of strength. * * *

From my heart and in Jesus Christ crucified,

Your very sincere and devoted friend,

F. HURTER.

Schaffhausen, August 2, 1844.

I will here conclude this plain account by the statement mentioned in the preceding letter. This will serve as a recapitulation of all the facts recorded in the above pages: it will shew the way pursued by Hurter, and the effects produced by the Divine grace in his understanding and soul; and will be read as one of the most open, clear, and energetic professions of faith which have ever been produced by a heart reconciled to God and his Church.

Hurter's Exposition of the Motives which led to his Conversion to the Catholic Church.

The course of study which I was obliged to follow for the composition of my *History of Pope Innocent III.* had drawn my attention to the wonderful structure which distinguishes the edifice of the Catholic Church. I was delighted with the contemplation of the wonderful influence possessed by that long succession of Sovereign Pontiffs, all worthy of their high position; and I admired the vigilance with which they guarded the unity and purity of doctrine.

In juxtaposition with these facts appeared the changeableness of Protestant sects, their miserable dependence on the State, their internal divisions, and the spirit of individualism which submits matters of doctrine to the unlimited analyses of critics, the rationalism of theologians, and the liberal interpretation of preachers. As regards myself, in the position of preacher, and afterwards of spiritual director of a Protestant canton of Switzerland, I looked upon myself as a sentinel charged with the duty of guarding a post half

lost, which he is obliged to defend with a firm and courageous resolution, and by every means in his power. It was with this intention that I wished to uphold with the most inflexible firmness all the fundamental dogmas of revelation, such as the Trinity, original sin, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and the redemption. The whole course of my instruction, both as preacher and professor, was directed against every attempt of Rationalism. I therefore seriously applied myself to strengthen and maintain the surviving remains of true doctrine. However, at this time the special object of my studies was directed rather to the external than internal Church, to her history and constitution rather than to her dogmas. At the same time, my religious convictions were already shocked to see the fraction of Protestants to which I belonged reject altogether the devotion to the Blessed Virgin; whether it was that her very existence was made no account of, or that she was looked upon as the same as any other mother, and simply as a pious woman. From my earliest years, without having sought to instruct myself on the matter by reading, without having entered into any discussion, without knowing any thing in particular of the Catholic doctrine concerning the Mother of God, I was already penetrated with feelings of inexpressible veneration for her. I looked upon her as the advocate of Christians; and from the inmost recess of my heart, and in the secrecy of private life, I addressed myself to her. In the Protestant pulpit it is allowed to reject altogether whatever dogmas of Christianity the founders of Protestantism have thought proper to retain; whilst the wish to preserve or re-establish what they have rejected, would, without a doubt, meet with great opposition and severe censure on the part of Protestants. However, I attempted to direct attention to the Virgin (for such is the title given to her even in the Confession of Augsburg), and to recal to the recollection of my co-religionists the high signification of the title of Mother of God. To go beyond this was not possible in the particular position in which I then found myself.

In 1840 this improper question was put to me, "Are you truly a Protestant or not?" a question which arose, not from any thing connected with my public duties, but exclusively on account of my *History of Innocent III.*, and my journey to Vienna.* I refused to answer this question, because they sought rather to know what I did not believe than what I did. If, on the contrary, they had asked me if I was a Catholic, I would at that time have answered by a decided No. My re-

* See above.

fusal excited a complete storm against me, and ingratitude, limited ideas, a narrow-minded pietism, envy, revenge, and political hatred, were all united against a single man, who, on his side, defended himself vigorously.

To speak my real sentiments, I at this moment believe that I am indebted to my enemies, now that the fruits of justice and peace are ripe ; for I now perceive in those struggles which were then so painful to me the salutary means employed for my conversion. Convinced that God from my tenderest years has been pleased to lead me, though by such intricate ways, to the object to which I have attained, I now, at this happy moment of my life, look upon the storm which was raised against me as my signal and impulse to the course which I have followed from that time, sustained by a fixed and firm will.

I fell sick, together with all my family, and two well-beloved daughters were snatched from me by the hand of death ; and whilst in several Swiss Catholic convents prayers were being offered up for the recovery of my children, Pietism indulged in a cruel joy, happy to be able to pierce a father's heart with a triple-edged sword. I then felt thoroughly convinced that with such people there could be no truce, unless on the condition of submitting one's neck to the yoke of a wretched blindness. Could I hesitate about making a choice ? No, I rejected dignities, places, and revenues, and returned into private life, disgusted with a sect which by Rationalism is subversive of every Christian dogma, or by Pietism tramples morality under foot. Up to this period, however, I did not believe all the doctrines of the Catholic Church. But is it likely that four years in the life of a serious man who is fond of study, and has time to pursue it, would be allowed to pass away without either progressing or retrograding ? No one could suppose such a thing. The truth is, that the directions which Divine Providence had given to my mind had caused me to make progress which my private studies had aided. I will not say that individuals influenced me either directly or indirectly ; nevertheless, a light shone upon me, and every day the path which I was treading became more distinct. In the course of my studies I had to consult numerous works on the origin of the so-called Reformation, its causes, the means employed to establish its dogmas, and its influence on politics, particularly in England. Even in my own neighbourhood proofs were not wanting to shew the fury with which Rationalism is animated against the Catholic Church, whilst at the same time it leaves Protestantism undisturbed, or, rather, seeks an alliance with it in order to compass the object which is common

to them both, viz. the destruction of Catholicism. In the course of my studies I was struck by another remarkable fact, viz. that when Catholic nations have entered the path of political revolutions, they have it in their power to pause, and to re-organise themselves, whereas Protestant nations cannot stay themselves in the midst of their headlong movements; that Catholic nations, when carried onward with revolutionary delirium, recover much sooner from this social disease than Protestant nations, and the latter in proportion as their hostility to Catholicism diminishes.

The sight of the struggles which the Catholic Church goes through in our times, and throughout the world, had a decisive influence on my mind. I compared the moral worth of the opposite parties, and the means of combat made use of by both. Here, I beheld in the front ranks of the enemies of the Church, the Autocrat, in whom are found the cruelty of a Domitian and the craftiness of a Julian; there, political Pharisees, who emancipate the blacks and enslave white men, because these latter are Catholics, and under a harder yoke, and in dreadful misery; who traverse every sea, that with one hand they may in vain attempt to propagate the Gospel, and with the other furnish the discontented with arms. In one country (Prussia) we may behold the employment of a cunning and perfidious diplomacy in order to effect the fusion of Lutherans and Calvinists, the better to annihilate the Catholic Church; in other parts of Germany, ministerial despotism, inspired by the audacious and impudent doctrines of Hegel, make use of spies, *juges d'instruction*, fines and imprisonment against the priests who are faithful to their creed. In France, the Deputies use every artifice which an inexhaustible eloquence can suggest to impede the rights of the Church, and the Government makes desperate efforts to uphold a legislation, the offspring of the worst revolutionary passions; whilst there prevails a civilisation created by journalism, the idolatry of material interest, a philosophy directed against God Himself, youth brought up in principles destructive of social order, &c., one monstrous collection of men and things, clashing one against another to undermine the imperishable structure of Providence.

However, in spite of so much opposition, and so many attacks, the breath of a better spirit is felt. It would be hard to say from what quarter of the horizon it descends, but it cannot be denied that the Church is gaining ground on that very spot where the greatest efforts have been made against her. The very blows aimed against her only increase her strength; whilst the plots which the most powerful men have

formed against her, have, in spite of every effort, fallen to the ground. It is true that there are even some priests to be met with whose understandings are so limited as not to be able to appreciate fully the value of Catholic institutions; priests who imagine they can reduce the colossal edifice of the Church to the standard of their own low views; but happily we behold others who act with more spirit and vigour, who are not terrified at the sound of the word *Ultramontanism*, which is always in the mouths of those who wish to hinder the free and inviolable action of the Church.

These are the facts which caused me to reflect seriously on the existence of an institution, which, from its struggle with open and disguised enemies, comes out renewed and strengthened. After having resigned the office of President of the Consistory, I devoted my leisure hours to the study of Catholic doctrine, and I profited by the perusal of Moehler's *Symbolism*. Never for a moment had I doubted that Christianity was a divine revelation; but it was only at this time that I applied my mind to consider certain assertions made by Protestants, who, for example, assert that Christianity, pure and undefiled, existed only in the early ages, and that for the period of twelve hundred years it was buried in an abyss of errors and exclusively human institutions, an abyss which was at length closed on the arrival of these superior geniuses, viz. a monk full of every species of contradictions, and a debauched and spoliating king. Ought not common-sense itself to suffice to destroy all confidence in a pretended reformation undertaken by persons so wanting in moral worth? Add to this, the internal bickerings of so many Protestant sects, their disagreement on all essential doctrines, together with the fact of their being united only in their opposition and hatred against the Church. I was thus convinced that the discrepancies which exist in Protestant doctrine had shewn themselves from the very commencement of the Reformation, as they are now manifested amongst so many Protestants, who astonish us by the singularity of their systems, their readiness to modify them and to adapt them to the wants of the time. Another cause, not less decisive in enlightening my mind and fixing me in my resolution, was the certainty of finding, on the other hand, all the Catholic theologians united and agreed upon one body of doctrine. The language of Protestant innovators respecting an invisible Church, and the handing down the pure doctrine by means of an indefinite succession of heresies, can never blind any one who has retained or recovered the faculty of appreciating men and things. I was afterwards strengthened in my con-

victions by reading a German translation of the treatise entitled *An Explanation of the Holy Mass*, by Innocent III.

Such were the visible and palpable means by which God brought about my conversion, means which are within the reach of every one. The hidden causes which come from above, and are known only in heaven, must remain a secret to men. It was only after my reception into the fold of the Church that I was aware what a number of prayers had been addressed to the Eternal Father in different religious houses, by clergy and laity, in Rome, in other parts of Italy, in the Tyrol, Bavaria, Switzerland, and perhaps also in other countries, prayers which had been addressed to the Blessed Virgin for several years, in order to obtain her intercession with the Father of all mercy; it was only after my conversion that I learned how many Masses had been offered up to obtain for me the mercy of God. On the very day of my departure for Rome, a friend of mine at Paris recommended me to the Archconfraternity of the most Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary. Under the protection of all these pious sentiments I undertook a journey to Rome, February 29, 1844, fully decided to declare myself the faithful child of that tender mother, the Catholic Church.

At Pavia, through the intervention of a friend, and as a particular favour, the famous relics of the illustrious Bishop of Hippo were exposed to public veneration. With a trembling heart I drew near to those sacred remains, still keeping pent up within my bosom my feelings of respect and love, for the time for giving vent to them was not yet come. But I received from the contemplation of those holy relics a fresh and more ardent desire to accomplish my object. How could I refrain from looking upon that institution as noble, praiseworthy, and attractive, which, after more than fifteen hundred years, has never ceased to venerate the bodily frame of a superior mind, the lasting model of the most distinguished virtues, whereof the power and splendour still enlighten and impart vigour to the Church. These holy and ennobling thoughts were suggested in my mind by the perusal of a work by Canon Giovanni Bosisio, entitled, *Historical Description, with Documents, of the Gift made by the Church of Pavia, of a famous Relic of the Body of St. Augustin, to Mgr. Anthony Adolphus Dupuch, Bishop of Algiers.*

One thing might perhaps have had the effect of delaying the execution of my design, namely, any attempt of a praiseworthy though ill-timed zeal to hasten my conversion. On this head I had reason to be well pleased; for, during my three months' sojourn in Rome, no moral influence of any de-

scription was made use of to cause me to utter those solemn words which they so much wished to hear me pronounce. Once, and once only, during an interview which I had with the Holy Father, these words were, with the most inexpressible serenity, addressed to me: "*Spero che lei sarà mio figlio*" (I hope that I may some day call you my son). On another occasion, at Naples, the pious and learned Archbishop of Thessalonica, Mgr. Rossi, said to me, "I hope that you will be one of us." Several other friends and protectors expressed a like desire, but without ever going further. Although I had the happiness and honour of frequent and familiar conversations with the celebrated R. Father Perrone, of the Society of Jesus, that saintly and learned man only once alluded to what was uppermost in his heart. When, on the feast of St. Lewis of Gonzaga, I thanked him with all my soul for having never touched upon the subject, he made me this reply: "I foresaw full well that the grace of God would do all, and therefore the intervention of man would have been superfluous." At Mount Cassino, that monastery so illustrious, and the mother of so many abbeys and congregations, the conversation one day turned upon my conversion; when fears were entertained of my drawing down upon my head the fury of hatred, if it were to take place in a solemn manner instead of in the retreat and silence of some isolated and unfrequented church, "I am decided," said I, "to make my abjuration nowhere else but at Rome; and I neither seek nor shun publicity, more or less great, in an affair which does not require concealment, because it is good, just, and praiseworthy; and especially in an affair of such great importance to me, I wish to act in that open manner which I have ever made the rule of my conduct."

Although in the preface to a collection of miscellaneous writings, published a short time before my departure for Rome, I had pretty clearly made known my intended conversion, nevertheless I had never entered upon any explanation on this subject with my wife. I proposed to write to her on the subject of my intention; in fact, my letters dated from Pisa already indicated it in a manner which became every day more clear and distinct the nearer I approached Rome. Thanks to God, I had the great consolation of meeting with a tenderly affectionate but temperate opposition from my wife, which in the end was nothing but the anxiety of a mother solicitous for the future lot of her children.

In this, as well as all other circumstances, God's holy will was clearly manifest. Being at peace on that head, I was unwilling to delay the execution of this important step. On

the 14th of June I declared to his Eminence Cardinal Ostini, the only friend who was entrusted with my secret, that there was nothing now to hinder my reception into the bosom of the Church. The day and the hour for my abjuration were fixed for the following Sunday, 16th of June, in his Eminence's apartments. I thought it my duty to acquaint his Holiness with my intention, as he had deigned to honour me with so much goodwill and paternal kindness. When my letter was brought to his Holiness' cabinet, Mgr. Cardinal Secretary of State was there, and the Holy Father, who rejoiced at the news, made it known to him. Both of them disapproved of my intention of confining myself at present to a simple declaration and signature of an act of abjuration, in order that I might afterwards, on my return to Switzerland, perform the other ceremonies.

My reception into the Catholic Church took place on the 16th of June, 1844, on the feast of St. Francis Regis; and I made my first communion, and received confirmation, the 21st of June, the feast of St. Lewis of Gonzaga. On this occasion, Mgr. Cardinal Ostini remembered with emotion that thirty years ago, in this same chapel of St. Lewis of Gonzaga, he had received into the bosom of the Catholic Church the illustrious painter Overbeck, who now stood as sponsor for me. I had the honour to receive the holy communion singly, before the youthful students of Rome who were assembled for this ceremony, in order to prove to them that a course of serious and impartial studies never fail to lead the mind to identify itself with the living unity of the Church. The presence of a great number of friends in Rome, from Germany, France, and Switzerland, on this day, so memorable for me, was an additional stimulus to courage and perseverance.

Oratorium Parvum.

No. III.

THE PILGRIM QUEEN.

[iv.]

THERE sat a Lady all on the ground,
 Rays of the morning circled her round ;
 Save thee, and hail to thee, gracious and fair !
 In the chill twilight what would'st thou there ?

“ Here I sit desolate,” sweetly said she,
 “ Though I am a Queen, and my name is Marie ;
 Robbers have rifled my garden and store,
 Foes they have stolen my Heir from my bower.

They said they could keep Him far better than I,
 In a palace all his, planted deep and raised high :
 'Twas a palace of ice, hard and cold as were they,
 And when summer came it all melted away.

Next would they barter Him, Him the Supreme,
 For cotton, for iron, for gas, and for steam :
 And me they bid wander in weeds and alone
 In this green merry land which once was my own.”

I looked on that Lady, and out from her eyes
 Came the deep glowing blue of Italy's skies ;
 And she raised up her head, and she smiled, as a Queen
 On the day of her crowning, so bland and serene.

“ A moment,” she said, “ and the dead shall revive,
 The giants are failing, the saints are alive ;
 I am coming to rescue my home and my reign,
 And Peter and Philip are close in my train.”

ω

[v.]

ST. PHILIP'S CONVERTS.

SWEET Saint Philip ! thou hast won us,
 Though our hearts were hard as stone ;
 Sin had once wellnigh undone us,
 Now we live for God alone.
 Help in Mary ! Joy in Jesus !
 Sin and self no more shall please us !
 We are Philip's gift to God.

Sweet Saint Philip! we are weeping,
 Not for sorrow, but for glee!
 Bless thy converts, bravely keeping
 So the bargain made with thee.
 Help in Mary! Joy in Jesus!
 Sin and self no more shall please us!
 We are Philip's gift to God.

Sweet Saint Philip! old friends want us
 To be with them as before;
 And old times, old habits haunt us,
 Old temptations press us sore.
 Help in Mary! Joy in Jesus!
 Sin and self no more shall please us!
 We are Philip's gift to God.

Sweet Saint Philip! do not fear us;
 Get us firmness, get us grace;
 Only thou, dear Saint! be near us;
 We shall safely run the race.
 Help in Mary! Joy in Jesus!
 Sin and self no more shall please us!
 We are Philip's gift to God.

Sweet Saint Philip! make us wary;
 Sin and death are all around:
 Bring us Jesus! bring us Mary!
 We shall conquer and be crowned.
 Help in Mary! Joy in Jesus!
 Sin and self no more shall please us!
 We are Philip's gift to God.

Sweet Saint Philip! keep us humble,
 Make us pure as thou wert pure;
 Strongest purposes will crumble
 If we boast, and make too sure.
 Help in Mary! Joy in Jesus!
 Sin and self no more shall please us!
 We are Philip's gift to God.

Sweet Saint Philip! come and ease us
 Of the weary load we bear;
 Place us in the heart of Jesus,
 Dearest Saint! and leave us there.
 Help in Mary! Joy in Jesus!
 Sin and self no more shall please us!
 • We are Philip's gift to God.

Reviews.

IMAGES AND IMAGE-WORSHIP.

The Seventh General Council, the Second of Nicæa, in which the Worship of Images was established: with copious Notes from the "Caroline Books," compiled by order of Charlemagne for its Confutation. Translated from the Original by the Rev. John Mendham, M.A., Rector of Clophill. London, Painter.

HAD this volume been simply what the title-page announces, it would have been a valuable contribution to our English stock of ecclesiastical documents. As it is, indeed, to those who can "separate the precious from the vile," it will be of use in illustrating a very interesting period in the history of the Church. More we cannot say. We cannot even pay the compiler the sorry compliment of having brought together in a summary form the chief arguments and authorities which have been urged against Catholic doctrine and practice in the matter of which he treats. Whatever his qualifications as a translator,* Mr. Mendham is no controversialist, much less a theologian, judging him even by a Protestant standard; he has very imperfectly digested what others have written on his own side, and his own remarks, in which unfortunately he largely indulges, are utterly worthless, except as an instructive specimen of heretical childishness and folly.† To say the truth, but for its documentary contents, to which we shall mainly confine ourselves in the observations we have to make, the book is below criticism, and we should never have thought it worth our while to draw attention to its publication.

As, however, we have spoken thus disparagingly of the work, it is well, perhaps, that we should, as briefly as possible, shew cause for the judgment we have passed.

We have said that Mr. Mendham has displayed no originality in his management of the materials at his disposal, and

* We observe a curious mistranslation at p. 201. Mr. Mendham renders the well-known words of the Preface in the Mass, *Tremunt potestates*, thus, "The powers of darkness do tremble." But this is but a sample of the ludicrous blunders with which the work abounds. Surely it implies great presumption in a man to take upon himself to criticise and to condemn what, had he common modesty, he cannot but be aware he knows nothing about.

† We had begun by noticing some of these absurdities; but we found them so numerous and so very silly—so incredibly silly—that we abandoned the attempt.

this is emphatically true of the historical sketch which forms the introduction to the volume; it bears no marks of critical research or independent judgment whatsoever. He merely repeats the libellous narratives of Spanheim and Gibbon, and, like the latter infamous writer, makes supposition and insinuation supply the place of historical testimony where none exists to his purpose, and give a colouring of falsehood to such facts as tell against him. By begging the whole question that "image-worship" is idolatry—of which obstinate assumption we shall say more hereafter—and that iconoclasm was therefore so far a form of pure Christianity; and by metamorphosing the furious tyrants who then occupied the throne of the East into zealous reformers of the Church, and the monks and prelates who opposed them into rebels as well against the righteous dominion of their earthly sovereign as against the incommunicable majesty of God Himself; it may be imagined with what ease he reverses the facts of history, and transforms one of the fiercest persecutions* that ever raged against the

* The nature of the persecution may be learned from the Acts of the Nicean Council.

"What tongue can worthily relate the dire tragedy? Whence or how shall I follow out each sad detail? How shall I enumerate the conturbations, the flights, the persecutions, the imprisonment and beating of monks in the city, their long captivity for many years, the chains which bound their feet, the abstraction of the sacred vessels, the burning of books, the profanation of holy temples, the impious transformation of sacred monasteries into worldly houses of resort?—so that the holy men who dwelt in them, seeing their goods now plundered, went away into barbarous countries, after the manner of the Apostles, accounting it better to live amongst the heathen than to endure the profane conversation of their own countrymen, acting in obedience to the precept of the divine Apostle, 'That with such they should not eat.'

"And what is most dreadful of all, is this impious profanation of holy monasteries, which impiety among certain is kept up most lawlessly even to the present time, when, instead of sacred hymns and the voice of rejoicing in the tabernacles of the just, is now heard only satanic and impious songs; and instead of the frequent genuflexion, nought but the licentious contortion of the dancer is now to be seen.

"And with this profanation we must enumerate the dangers, the disturbances, the confusion, the cutting out of tongues, the putting out of eyes, the slittings of the nose, the disgraceful banishments which befel these holy men, so that they have been scattered over the face of the earth. Again, the branding of their faces, the burning of their beards, the lawless and compulsory unions of virgins after they have been consecrated to Christ, and, worse than all the rest, the murder of certain."

Mr. Mendham tries to palliate the enormity of these proceedings by observing, that "they belong more to the times than to any heresy," and by drawing a parallel between them and the punishments judicially inflicted by the Spanish Inquisition, and the cruelties committed in the Albigensian and other religious wars. This is not the place to enter upon the subject, particularly as we have discussed it at some length on former occasions; we will only remark that any how our author has overlooked one essential point, viz. the heinous immorality and impiety which distinguished this persecution, and which have always distinguished every outbreak of anti Catholic violence. We observe that

supernatural truth of Christ into a vehement outbreak of jealousy for his honour. Having no historical data to oppose to the accounts which contemporary writers have left on record, he does not scruple to affirm that "the image-worshippers have taken good care that nothing of this kind should come down to posterity"* (p. xxxi.), and, starting from his own preconceptions of the matter in dispute, finds, as he says (p. xi.), "very fair reason from the nature of the *thing itself*" to conclude that the conduct of the emperors is capable of a very different construction to that which "the persecuted orthodox" have put upon it. Accordingly, Leo's attempt to subvert the established devotions of the Church he regards as "the result of conviction on his part of the truth of the reproaches" brought against them by Jews, Mohammedans, and other unbelievers; and finding a Catholic historian disposed to admit, that some of the worst atrocities attributed by later authors to Constantine Copronimus may have been credited on "popular reports without much examination," he concludes,

Mr. Mendham appeals to Llorente as an authority. Of this writer Balmez remarks (*Protestantism and Catholicity compared*, p. 401), "King Joseph, the intruder, intrusted Llorente with the archives of the Supreme Council and the Tribunal of the Inquisition. This excellent man was so perfect an archivist, that he *burnt all the reports of proceedings* with the approbation of his master (*as he himself tells us*), with the exception of those which could appertain to history, &c. After having heard this remarkable confession, we will ask every impartial man whether there is not room for great mistrust with respect to an historian who claims to be sole and *unique* because he has had the opportunity of consulting the original documents whereon he founds his history, and who, nevertheless, *burns and destroys these same documents*."

The reader will better perceive the application of this extract when he has perused the following note.

* The Iconoclasts clandestinely burned and mutilated writings which recognised the use of holy images; yet this dishonest *mutilation of documents to serve a purpose* Mr. Mendham applauds (p. 236), on the ground that they contained "instruction which causeth to err," while the destruction in open day of *heretical* books (for such he must admit they were regarded by the Catholics), he condemns in a passage the tenor of which may be gathered from the closing words: "Yet these wretched idolaters, these miserable destroyers of books, are, forsooth, Catholic Bishops, orthodox Prelates, and so forth, of the Church of Christ!"

Being on the subject of mutilations, we are reminded of an amusing instance of the lengths to which extreme prejudice and extreme ignorance united will carry a man. Leontius, the legate of the East, in the course of an argument in which he is drawing a distinction—mark this—between Christian images and Gentile idols, quotes Solomon, saying (Wisdom xiv. 8), "Bless ye the wood whence cometh righteousness," *i.e.* of course, the Cross. Upon which Mr. Mendham shrewdly remarks, p. 173, "Leontius, it seems, could mutilate Scripture as well as others, for he leaves out the last part of this verse as being opposed to his views. That which is left out is as follows: 'That which is made with hands is *accursed*, and *he* also that made it.'" Mr. M., in his turn, knows well where to stop in quoting from Scripture. The verse continues, "He, because he made it, and it, because, being corruptible, it was called *god*" (Protestant version). Need we ask whether we were right in saying the book was "below criticism?"

not that these reports had their probable foundation in those acts of "debauchery, cruelty, and brutality" which contemporary writers have recorded against him, but that these writers were themselves guilty of "unblushing exaggerations" and "calumnious statements," and are unworthy of belief altogether.

And so every account that goes to shew the odiousness of the persecution waged against the Catholics he dismisses as "a fable, an invention of after-times;" or he puts it aside as resting on the suspicious testimony of the persecuted; or when that is impossible, he represents (p. xl.) the sufferers as having "provoked" the imperial "vengeance by personal insults" and officious interference in matters out of their province. His onesidedness in this respect is patent to every reader. They who fell in the many sanguinary struggles which were occasioned by the wanton demolition of images venerated by the people, he invariably describes as being "murdered" by the Catholic party; while in the "mutilations and stripes, fines and exile" which were inflicted on their opponents, he sees (p. xx.) "nothing but the punishment of rebels against lawful authority." So devoid is he of religious feeling, that he cannot understand the indignation which the outrages perpetrated against objects they held most dear and sacred excited in the minds of the Catholics of the time; his admiration is all for the perpetrators. To strike a crucifix on the face, or to send to seize the Pope by force of arms, in order to compel him to yield to the imperial edict, are alike to him meritorious acts of piety and firmness. He seems perfectly unable to appreciate a generous loyalty to God, or to conceive the possibility of a zeal so devoted as should make men confront death in its most terrible forms rather than deny their faith; and, consequently, those heroic souls who "resisted unto blood" the awful profanity in which it was attempted to make them participate, are in his eyes but "wretched fanatics" (p. 126) who rushed on their own destruction. One passage is worth recording, as exemplifying the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, and a Protestant's notion of civil and religious liberty where Catholics are concerned. Leo IV. had discovered two images in his wife's chamber:—

"Having found out that these images were brought into her chamber by one of her officers named Papias, and that five others had been accomplices with him, he caused them to be shorn and severely beaten and imprisoned: one out of the number died under the punishment. He is, of course, called a martyr; but he was a martyr in no other way than that condemned by the Apostle, who

says: '*Let none of you suffer as an evil doer and a busybody in other men's matters.*'"*

In simple truth, Mr. Mendham has no sympathy either with orthodoxy or with sanctity. Such things are far above out of his sight. We might make a curious collection of his theological dicta touching heresies which strike at the very integrity of the Christian faith. Thus, alluding to the controversy on the subject of the procession of the Holy Ghost, he says (p. 91), "This difference is one of those which separates the Eastern from the Western Church, and which not even tradition or Catholic consent can settle."† Of the Monothelite, Polychronius, who pretended to miraculous powers, and was proved to be an impostor, he pityingly exclaims (p. 112), "The poor fellow was anathematised!" The Paulicians also come in for a share of his sympathies. "If Germanus," he says (p. 222), "represented the sentiments of the Eastern and Gregory those of the Western Church, in this century at least the Church was in error; and truth was to be found among the iconoclasts of the East, or the semi-iconoclasts of France and Germany, or the persecuted sect of the Paulicians." What this poor persecuted sect really was, the incredulous reader may discover from the pages of Mosheim,‡ a Protestant historian, who declares that they "distinguished the Creator of the world from the Supreme Being," considering "matter to be the seat and source of all evil," and that they obstinately rejected the institutions of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the Divine authority of the Old Testament, as well as of part of the New. Such patronage comes ill from a man who accuses Popes of a want of sensitiveness in the matter of orthodoxy where temporal rule is concerned. But this is not the only maligned race which he takes under his protection. While labouring to fasten the guilt of idolatry on the whole Christian Church, he goes out of his way to exculpate the Mahometans from the charge. "Mahomet," he says (p. 232), "taught them to detest idols." Again, his language when speaking of Nestorianism is, to say the least, very equivocal. Thus he asks (p. 406), "Why might not the [pseudo-] Council of Constantinople as rightfully issue their decree against idolatrous pic-

* The italics are the author's.

† There is something very significant in the loose ambiguous way in which even the most "orthodox" of Anglican divines express themselves respecting this article of the faith. We should not be surprised any day at hearing that it was declared to be an open question in the Anglican Church, or that some theologian deeply read in the Fathers had discovered that "antiquity" lends no sanction to what it has been usual to regard as the Catholic doctrine on the authority of the Nicene Creed.

‡ Ecclesias. Hist. Century IX. chap. v.

ture-worship as that of Ephesus against the *presumed* heresy of Nestorius?" And again (p. 416): "Now if Nestorius be called a heretic because he is affirmed to have worshipped the human nature apart from the divine—because of some *theoretical speculations* which he set forth,—how much more," &c. We find him also speaking (p. 108) in a commiserating way of the condemnation of the "*unfortunate* Nestorius."

Monks are his especial aversion; he cannot mention them without a sneer, as in the following fashion (p. 18): "How little account do monks make of Fathers, &c., if it does not suit their fancies!" He particularly dislikes their going such lengths in mortification and devotion, and marks his displeasure by italicising, thus: "The next seven years he (Anastasius) spent in a convent at Jerusalem, acting in all mockery of humility as *cook, gardener, &c.*, never omitting the hearing of *Mass*."* But this was not the extent of his hypocritical folly. "Not content with this, he must needs go back to Persia, not as a missionary, but as a martyr, and all went to his mind: he was arrested, threatened, persecuted, and tortured." Despite, however, the uncomfortableness which such extremes occasion him, our author amiably relents at the end, and says, "Possibly he really was a pious man, but his history is sadly disfigured with Romish legends and Romish falsehoods."

The light which even Protestant historians have let in upon the common world, with respect to the origin of the political power of the Popes and the influence of the Church on the civilisation of Europe, has not penetrated the religious seclusion of the Rectory of Clophill. In one condensed and pithy sentence, of which we are sorry to be obliged to defraud our readers, he puts forth all his literary strength, and describes how "that despotic rule," that "dreaded authority," grew with each succeeding Pope by "pious frauds and artful forgeries," by "the terrors of priestcraft" and "the intrigue of the politician," by "exciting internal discords," and "setting nation against nation" and "party against party." It is the Pope on whom he vents his silliest sarcasms; the very recurrence of the name is enough to call forth something of the spite and hatred with which his pen is charged. One instance will suffice. At p. xxvi. he represents Pope Stephen, in order

* Mr. Mendham perhaps here means to insinuate that the mention of "Mass" is an anachronism, since on Leontius, the legate of the East, saying (p. 172) in the Council, "We Christians know nothing either of altars or sacrifice," he remarks in a note, "Surely Leontius was somewhat oblivious, when he forgot both the sacrifice of the Mass and the unbloody sacrifice which others talk about." Yet, if such be his meaning, the obliviousness is on his own part, since the "unbloody sacrifice" is expressly named by the Council, page 316.

to enforce his claim to the protection of Pepin, sending him a letter "*pretended to have come from St. Peter, now in glory, stating the fear that he had lest the Lombards should ill-treat his bones.*" Mr. Mendham knows very well that the Pope never said or did any thing of the kind; and we quote this piece of low buffoonery only to shew the temper of the writer and the degree of veracity which attaches to his "Historical Sketch."

We will not trouble our readers with any further exposure of the coarseness and profanity in which this Protestant minister continually indulges; one line alone will reveal to them the almost incredible depth of degradation to which Protestantism proper sinks its unhappy professors. In the "Table of Contents" there is the following entry (p. lxxxv.), "Extract from the Life of a Courtesan called the 'Blessed Mary of Egypt.'" Did Mr. Mendham ever read in the Gospel of one of whom it was said, "Many sins are forgiven her because she hath loved much?" But it is in vain to reason with such an adversary: may the blessed saint whom he has blasphemed pray to God for her reviler, that he may learn to love purity and penitence!

Inexcusable as is his ignorance and presumption, and gross as is his unfairness and want of candour, we could have found some palliation for it all in inveterate prejudice and the misfortune of his heretical position; but nothing can excuse the ribaldry to which he gives loose on every occasion, as if his object were to throw ridicule on the holiest things, like any avowed scoffer or man of the world who gives nobody credit for religious sincerity, and laughs at the supernatural. We have read the volume carefully through, and with every disposition to make allowances for the disadvantages under which the writer labours; and we are fain to say that the impression left upon our mind is such as it is most painful to entertain of one who calls himself a Christian. It is, we can assure Mr. Mendham, with the greatest difficulty (except on the supposition of extreme intellectual incapacity) that we can give him credit for sincerity, or believe him to be possessed of any spark of genuine piety. There is only one excuse we can invent for him, and that is, that he has taken his blasphemy second-hand from those whom he venerates as his masters—"Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Jewel,"* and the rest; that he writes as he has been taught, without thinking what it is he is

* Luther would have spared not only the crucifix, but other images, and quarrelled with Carlostadt for his iconoclasm. But where retained they cannot be said to be used.

saying. We cannot withhold our severest censure on the work; but thus much it is only fair to say of him—he has the Fathers of his Church upon his side.

But enough of this. Let us pass to the argument of the book. The view which Mr. Mendham takes of the rise and progress of “image-worship” is that which is common to Protestants on such subjects. He describes it as “one of those corruptions of Christianity which crept into the Church stealthily, and almost without notice or observation.” In support of this view he goes on to state, that “the worship paid to images in the eighth century was not primitive,” and that

“Not only do we find no allusion in the early Fathers to any such reverence of images as the Council of Nice enjoins, but, on the contrary, language utterly inconsistent with it; and from their way of arguing against the Gentiles, we may very fairly infer that no such practice was ever known amongst them as that of bowing the head to images, prostration before them, or the offering of incense or lighting of candles, all which practices are now adopted alike by the Church of the East and of the West. * * *

“There are three successive æras through which we may trace the progress of this corruption. The first æra extends from the Apostolic age to that of Constantine the Great, during which period images were not admitted into churches at all. The second æra dates from the time of Constantine to that of Pope Gregory, surnamed the Great: in this period, though images were admitted into churches, there is no record of any worship being paid to them. The third æra is that which followed the time of Gregory, in which images were everywhere set up in churches and worshipped. * *

“That during the second period images were pretty generally admitted into churches cannot be denied; but that there was any authorised worship of them, or that the worship of them was considered in any way a Christian duty during the same period, cannot be proved. The testimonies, as far as they are genuine, which were selected by the Nicene divines from the Fathers who flourished during these centuries, prove that images were, indeed, set up in churches, Martyria, Basilicæ, and the like, but not that they were worshipped. Still, though the worship of them was not authorised, it had begun by degrees to creep into the Church.”

Before expressing any opinion on the historical question, we must say a few words on the nature of the argument which the writer employs. Mr. Mendham, as we have said, is an old-fashioned Church-of-England Protestant; at any rate, he does not belong to the modern Anglican school; yet both parties, however otherwise irreconcilably opposed to each other, have this peculiarity in common, that, so long as they can strike at Rome, they care not what deadly wounds they

inflict on themselves or on Christianity in general. They go to antiquity, not so much to prove that themselves are in the right as that Rome is in the wrong; nay, as if for the express purpose of demonstrating that certain doctrines which their own communion disowns, certain practices which it repudiates, certain claims which it denies, are, if not primitive, at least very ancient. This has been one result of the industry, the accuracy, and, we will say, the honesty—the material literary honesty—with which ecclesiastical history has been studied by recent scholars and critics. The effect is nothing less than a new historical Christianity. Multitudes almost unconsciously adopt as their speculative belief, for it is nothing more than this in very many instances, a view of ancient Christianity, which is as inconsistent with the past acts and ordinances of the English Establishment as it is with its present teaching and practice, and indeed, as every candid person must allow, with its general mind and character as displayed in all its changeful history during the last three centuries.

We cannot but think that Mr. Mendham has, unwittingly and against his will, contributed his support to views respecting the early Church and the relation which the Church of Rome bears thereto, which he would most strongly condemn, and against which this very publication is probably intended to be at once an argument and a protest. In attempting to fasten the charge of idolatrous innovation on the later Church, he does in fact, by the very terms of the accusation no less than by the positive amount of evidence which he adduces, testify to the *use*, and not the use only, but the *religious* use, as distinguished from the merely ornamental and architectural employment, of images, whether painted or sculptured, in the early times of Christianity. And more than this, he supplies the key by which thoughtful minds will be enabled to ascertain the grounds on which the Church sanctions that veneration and, in a Catholic sense, “worship” of images which was formally established by the Seventh General Council.

It is astonishing to observe how blind men remain to the fact, that, while all that recent searchers into ecclesiastical antiquity have determined against the Church of Rome is of a purely *negative* character, all that they have *positively* established is directly in her favour. Though they have in vain looked for the Papal Supremacy, they have found a Primacy, and that all but, if not altogether, of Divine right; though they have not found that visible connexion with the See of Peter is necessary to Catholic unity, they *have* found that visible unity is itself of the “essence” of the Catholic Church;

though they have not found that images were worshipped as they were in subsequent times, they *have* found that they were "set up in churches, Martyria, Basilicæ, and the like;" and that, "though the worship of them was not authorised, it had begun by degrees to creep into the Church;" "one practice after another having been gradually introduced in connexion with it," until "when, at length, an endeavour was made to root it out, the evil was found too deeply fixed to admit of removal." Strange result! all their positive conclusions, whatever they be, are for the Roman Church and against their own communion. Antiquity discovers to them a Church unlike their own, but in its prominent features, its essential characteristics, its determinate tendencies, like what they call the Roman, only without this or that pretension, this or that excrescence, this or that decision of form. They call it a corruption, or they call it an exaggeration, according to the school to which they belong; but, whatever it be, it is not a corruption or an exaggeration of any thing they possess themselves, but of what primitive Christianity was, and what it still would be, but for the adventitious matter in question. Remove the corruption, or abate the exaggeration, and the result is, not the Church of England, but the Church of Rome, minus whatever it be to which they object. Let any man ask himself what he has gained from the many controversial works which have issued of late years from the Anglican press, what he has learnt to *believe*, whether as respects his own communion or religious truth in general; his answer, at least when analysed, will be a merely negative one. He has learned that Roman devotion to the Blessed Virgin finds no support in primitive antiquity; that Transubstantiation is not the doctrine the Fathers, nor even—this is the latest discovery—of the most eminent scholastic divines; that Penance is not "generally necessary to salvation;" that the Pope is not the source of jurisdiction;—that images are not to be "worshipped." What is to be held as Catholic, Apostolical, primitive, true, on all these points, he has not learnt. A tenable position, theological or historical, for his own Church he has not gained; neither has he been furnished with any solid foundations whereupon to rest his faith in the divine character of the Christian revelation. In their anxiety to defend themselves from some internal foe, or to strike a blow at Rome, the teachers of the day, with a sort of blind fatuity, have snatched at weapons fatal alike to every so-called Church, and to Christianity itself.

But so it is; whatever be the school of Protestantism to which the writers belong, the only conclusion which a rational

and logical mind can draw from their labours is, that truth is not ascertainable. If, as the High Churchman declares, the Church being divided has lost its infallible voice, what authority is there in matters of faith? or how know we that the Church was not in a similar condition, from similar causes, in times which they repute to be orthodox and safe? Or if, as Mr. Mendham asserts, the whole Christian Church was sunk in idolatry for centuries, and while "it seemed all glorious without, within was full of corruption, formality, and hypocrisy," of what value can it ever be even as a witness to the truth? or how know we that "she was on her guard," as he says she was, "and speedily silenced" the heresies which "had not been wanting from the first?" And here let us ask our author, of what authority really to him or to any Protestant is the pseudo-Council of Constantinople on which he so much relies, or indeed the whole united Church of the East? None whatever. At most, it is but an historical evidence that at a certain era certain doctrines and practices of Rome were impugned by certain parties, with whom in this particular, and in nought else, he chances to agree. This is all; the Catholic Church neither denies the fact, nor regards the impugnors as any thing better than heretics. Why, then, all this trouble to prove what, when proved, possesses no weight in the eyes either of Catholics or Protestants? As well might he labour to shew that Arius denied the consubstantiality of the Son to the Father, or that Luther denied the Catholic doctrine of justification, and was followed by multitudes in his separation from Catholic communion. The heresy of the iconoclasts is a fact, and nothing more. To the simple Protestant, anyhow, it can have no argumentative force or value whatever; because truth with him is not what he finds in antiquity or in this or that century, not what the Church in this or that part of it has approved and decided, but what by his own study of Scripture he sees to be written therein. The Anglican goes, or thinks that he goes, by antiquity, or by the Church of the past; but as there were heresies from the first, and opposing communions, each of which called itself the only true Church of Christ, he cannot distinguish Catholics from heretics, or the true Church from the false, except on some preconceived notion as to what is Catholic and true. In both cases the result is practical Deism. Neither party is able to say *what* is that system of truth which God has revealed.

We say, then, that inquirers who pick and choose from among the facts of history such as suit their purpose for the moment, or take as an authority at one time what they reject

at another, are playing into the hands of infidelity.* They destroy all belief in a divine authority, and by consequence in a divine revelation; nay, they destroy all confidence in human or historical testimony. Their conclusions being negative, are in fact infidel conclusions. They establish nothing. They throw every thing into doubt. The result is a negation, belief in—nothing.

But now let us inquire of what value in the eyes of Catholics is such an argument from history as Mr. Mendham has instituted. The matter is simple enough, and may be dismissed in few words; but a certain importance is attached to it, because some who are without have strangely imagined that because Catholic writers have differed in their historical views, they are at variance with each other both as to the grounds of their faith and its subject-matter. That discrepancies are to be found in certain particulars between older and later historians is a fact so patent, that the very title-page of their edited works announces it. Later authors have corrected the mistakes of their predecessors; and, as is well known to those who are interested in the progress of historical research, considerable modification of opinion has from time to time taken place among the learned as to the comparative antiquity of certain doctrinal statements, or of certain devotional practices, which gradually won their way and received the authoritative sanction of the Church. Criticism, comparatively a modern science,† has done its work in separating the doubtful from the authentic in the matter both of historical and of documentary evidence. The field of history, like that of philology, is open ground. The Catholic does not derive his faith from historical study, neither does he rest it thereupon. His faith is what the Church teaches as faith. Whether that faith was taught in as explicit a shape so many centuries back, is a question on which he is at liberty to form such judgment as the evidence of facts may seem to him to warrant. Such question is altogether removed from the province of faith, and falls within that of historical criticism; in other words, it is a matter of individual research, study, and learning. Original sin is an article of the faith which it is Pelagianism to

* Mr. Mendham is more than usually suicidal in his statements. For if, as he declares, the Catholics mutilated and destroyed all documents that gave a true account of the iconoclastic controversy, why may they not also have falsified or suppressed every document relating to the earlier history of the Church which would have led to unpleasant disclosures? Surely such people are capable of any thing! How do we know that we possess the true records of Christianity, the genuine works of the Fathers, or the canon of Scripture itself?

† On this subject, consult Newman on Development, p. 28. See also some appropriate remarks by Balmez, ch. lxxii.

deny; but how far it was formally and explicitly held in the Church before the time of St. Augustine is a question on which theologians may differ. The actual sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin is an article of the faith not to be denied without the guilt of heresy; but how far St. Chrysostom was cognisant of this pre-eminent gift of the Mother of God is a question which may depend on the meaning to be attached to the expressions he uses, or the genuineness of the text in which such expressions occur. And so of other and the very holiest doctrines, as the consubstantiality of the Son to the Father, or the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son; Catholics may have held different opinions as to the distinctness and explicitness with which they were believed and taught in the Church before any controversy arose or a formal definition was pronounced. And yet, granting, or rather we should say maintaining, all this, it is no less true that, as fresh data have been supplied, or sounder principles of criticism have prevailed, or the attacks of heresy have been directed to some hitherto disregarded or unexplored spot, the unanimity which, speedily at least, if not at once, has been exhibited among Catholic writers is as remarkable as the boldness and perseverance with which they have followed up the course opened before them, and the victoriousness with which they have taken possession of the ground to which, perhaps, their adversaries were the first to point their attention, and which they had thought to occupy against them.

We readily admit, then, that Catholic controversialists have at times made statements about the antiquity of "image-worship" as now practised in the Church which further investigation has shewn to be incorrect or unfounded; and making this admission, we leave our opponents to make the most of it. For ourselves, following those writers who have looked closest into the matter, so far from contending that the reverence paid to holy images was, *explicitly*, in the previous centuries what it had become in the eighth, we would maintain that it was a matter of slow and progressive development; that, at first partial in form and local in extent, it gradually made way and assumed a distinct expression as circumstances called it forth or permitted its display. *Implicitly*, we believe that this reverence was ever the same; that the devotion with which some poor persecuted Christian in the catacombs kissed the symbol of his Master's passion, or bowed his head to worship Him represented in some rude sculpture as the Good Pastor of the flock, or in his own adorable Person as giving the keys of his kingdom to St. Peter, was substantially the same with the incensings, the lighting of lamps, the genu-

flexions and prostrations, with which, as Pagan persecution died away, the faithful delighted to honour his picture or his image in the streets and in the churches. It wore a less determined form in men's minds, and was associated with simpler rites, and performed perchance with a less conscious intention; but in itself it was the same act of worship which was enjoined by the Council of Nicæa and confirmed by succeeding Councils of the Church, which found a thousand eloquent expressions in the natural piety of the faithful, and has been subjected to metaphysical analysis by the most eminent masters in theology. That ancient authors should use arguments in disputing with Heathens which they would not have used had such practices been in vogue in their day as were common in subsequent times, is no more than we should have expected beforehand. Their language was unguarded simply because they were assailing Pagan superstition, not defending Catholic devotion. They were engaged in overthrowing false and unworthy ideas of God and his worship, and did so by arguments which could be turned against themselves only by proving that their own ideas were *similarly* false and unworthy. Whether they "worshipped" images or not, their arguments were in any wise valid against Heathenism; but, no doubt, they would have guarded their language from misapprehension, had such practices then prevailed as were afterwards introduced. Still, on the other hand, Catholic writers have thought that they found instances of the practice in primitive times which more or less resemble later developments, and expressions or reasonings or modes of thought in the earlier Fathers which, though not implying any conscious realisation of the subject, nevertheless indicate in what light they would have regarded it, had controversy arisen, or the question been dogmatically discussed in their day. And, speaking generally, we should say, that let the student once have grasped the real gist of a question, the elementary idea or principle which lies at the bottom of the matter, as separated from the points immediately under discussion; let him go to antiquity, not expecting to find a doctrine which was controverted in the eighth century clearly enunciated and elaborately defended by the writers of the centuries that preceded, but prepared to discover it rather implied than expressed, or at the least not distinctly and positively condemned by divines of credit, and the light which will be found to be thrown upon a difficult question will far exceed what at first sight it seemed reasonable to expect. The inquirer will rather be struck with the amount of positive evidence in favour of some dogma afterwards ruled by the Church; and will be astonished to

observe how writers, who had never perhaps consciously entertained the idea in their mind, have, as though withheld by some supernatural hand, avoided language and statements which the subject on which they were employed seemed under the circumstances of the time naturally to suggest.* We may hold a decided opinion on all these points with respect to the subject before us, and may attach a certain relative importance to them; but in itself, as we have said, the inquiry is one of mere historical interest, it has nothing to do with Catholic faith and worship.

And indeed, however much we might be disposed to take a different historical view of the matter, it would not be worth our while to enter into any discussion with the author before us, until a far more important question were settled, viz. what is the doctrine of the Catholic Church on the subject of sacred images? what is that veneration and worship which, whether by express definition or in her popular devotional system, she has sanctioned and encouraged? We need hardly say that these are points on which Mr. Mendham exhibits the grossest, and what to us appears the most obstinate ignorance. He seems to have taken not the slightest pains to ascertain, much less to understand, what Catholic theologians have written on the subject, or to eliminate the idea which lay at the root of the practice. He sets out by assuming that image-worship is simply idolatry, that very sin which is denounced in the Old Testament, as a turning away of the heart from God, and the serving of creatures instead of the Creator (pp. iv. vi.). Indeed, he expressly declares (p. viii.) that images and pictures came to be the "gods" of the people; and in another place (p. 118) he says, "the prayer is offered to the image; take *that* away, and their God is gone." Accordingly an image of Christ is with him nothing less than an idol! He adheres in interpretation to the text of the old Protestant Bible, as it stood in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, and St. John's warning, "Little children, keep yourselves from idols," is taken (p. iv.) literally to mean, "Little children, keep yourselves from *images*."† It were most ludicrous, but for the

* It never seems to occur to Protestants that doctrines which were disputed in the Church, and on which controversy arose, were just those points which, in the acknowledgment of both parties, till then had not been formally defined. In separated bodies the contrary is notorious. Disputes arise, and are carried on for years, nay, centuries, respecting doctrines which on either side are declared to be of the essence of the faith (as witness the baptismal controversy) without a hope of any other adjustment than that of a hollow and unprincipled compromise.

† So Col. iii. 5, "Covetousness, which is idolatry," in the Bibles of 1562, 1577, and 1579, stood thus, "Covetousness, which is the *worshipping of images*."

darkness of mind which it evinces, to observe the way in which he repeatedly alludes to the "second commandment," as if further argument were unnecessary, or the very repetition were an argument; as if the division of the Bible into verses, or of the ten commandments into four and six, were of divine authority, utterly ignoring the question, whether what he calls the second is any thing more than the continuation of the first, as well as the fact, that Catholics deny the interpretation which Protestants put upon the words to which he so triumphantly appeals.* "And for what," asks our author (p. xx.), "is God represented as being angry with Leo? for an earnest simple desire to cause the second commandment to be observed!" "If we are to believe the empress, she too was now greatly disquieted, as well as her courtiers, at the awful position in which *obedience to the second command* had placed them" (p. xlvii.).†

Again, on Pope Adrian asking, in his letter to Charlemagne (p. lvi.), "who is so answerable as himself for the tremendous guilt of allowing the sheep of Christ to perish in error?" we are favoured with the following commentary in

In like manner, where we read "a covetous man, who is an idolator," in the former editions we read "a covetous man, which is a *worshipper of images*." Instead of, "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" (2 Cor. vi. 16), it used to stand, "How agrees the temple of God with *images*?" Milner's *End of Controversy*, letter xxxiv.

* In the face, too, of the following, from among many other instances of a like sort:—

"But perhaps some one may say this—that we ought to reverence the commands of holy Scripture; such as, 'Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing which is in heaven above, or on the earth beneath, or in the waters which are under the earth: thou shalt not bow down to them, neither shalt thou worship them' (Exodus xx. 4, 5): and again, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain' (*Ibid.* 7): and in Deuteronomy, 'Ye shall not transgress, nor make to yourselves a graven image' (Deut. v. 16): and other passages like to these. But all these have one evident meaning—namely, that the divine nature must be considered as without form and incomprehensible; and that we should not, being influenced by conjectures and fancies to carnal conceptions, account it to be like to any of those things which are seen: for, having said before, 'Ye saw no manner of similitude in the day in which the Lord spake unto you from the midst of Horeb' (Deut. iv. 15), he immediately adds, 'Ye shall not transgress, nor make to yourselves a graven image' (*Ibid.* 16), and that which follows. Thus, in the first place, reminding them of what had been done in the making of the calf, and then giving a caution lest they also, imitating the manners of the Egyptians with which they were acquainted, should fall into the same impiety of thinking the Deity to be like unto such things. This also the great Apostle taught in the public assembly at Athens, saying, 'Forasmuch, then, as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device' (Acts xvii. 19). And to the same purpose we find this also, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord our God in vain' (Exodus xx. 7)—that is, Thou shalt not call or esteem as God that which is not so in truth, but has been vainly dignified with the idea and name of Deity."

† The italics are the author's.

a foot-note, "The error of obeying the second commandment." And so why the Pope could not attend the Council is wittily set down (p. xxxiii.) to his being "engaged at that very time with his clergy in carrying about his idols through the streets of Rome." Is this mere childishness, or is there not something of malice withal? Any how it is malice so childish, that one would suppose it to be deprived of all power to harm, were it not for the unlimited capacity that a certain credulous class of Protestants have of swallowing any thing which falls in with their unhappy prejudices, a capacity which in shallow minds is indefinitely increased by the mere fact of having read a book of a certain size emphatically supporting their own opinions with a show of knowledge, a few plausible misrepresentations, and much bold abuse. But enough of this. Begging the very question at issue, he pursues his way triumphantly. The language of the Fathers in controversy with Heathens is turned (p. lviii.) *ipsissimis verbis* against the Catholic Church. Their arguments against the superstitious belief, that idols were the habitation of the Deity, invisibly dwelling therein, are made to look like a censure of the Catholic practice of representing in an image the God made man, and worshipping Him thereby. Prohibitions against representations of the *essential* Deity are taken to condemn allegorical pictures of God the Father,* as He is described in vision by Daniel and St. John, or in parable by our Lord Himself. *All* honour, *all* worship shewn to images or crucifixes is simple idolatry. In short, one general false assumption† corrupts the whole perform-

* The Fathers of the Council expressly say again and again, "We never portray any image, form, or likeness of the invisible Godhead." Mr. Mendham speaks of four representations of God the Father as "far from uncommon" in the later Church. Two, he says (quoting Stillingfleet), are defended by Molanus and Thyrtæus, two they "disapprove." This is rather a mild rendering of the former's words; for of both the representations in question he declares that they are disapproved by those most in repute (a *clarissimis viris improbatæ*), and of one, that it is "a diabolical figment;" and in a note we read that it was *condemned by Pope Urban VIII.* He says also that separate images of God the Father, as if represented in his own proper Person, are not allowed by the Church, but such only as express his attributes or his works, or the relations in which He has revealed Himself to men, *i.e.* such as are symbolical or, in a manner, historical. *Historia SS. Imaginum*, lib. ii. chap. 3, 4. The Council of Trent decreed that no "images" should be set up which favoured false doctrine, or might be an occasion of dangerous error to the uninstructed; and that, where Scripture histories were represented by painting or sculpture, the people should be taught that the Divinity was not meant to be depicted therein, as though It could be seen with the bodily eyes, or expressed in colours and figures.

† Our readers will observe that we are not denying here what we stated above, that the Fathers employed language and arguments which they would not have employed had images been used in their day in the manner they were subsequently. What we assert is, that Mr. Mendham endeavours to support his charge

ance, wresting authorities from their meaning, perverting historical facts, and misrepresenting Catholic doctrine and practice.

Of course it would be easy enough to shew how completely Mr. Mendham's account is disproved and exploded by the documents which form his *pièces justificatives* in the matter. Those who will take the trouble to study the real history of the controversy, as contained in the only valuable portion of the volume, the acts of the Council itself, and the arguments adduced on both sides, will, we are confident, arrive at the very opposite conclusion to which the translator has unhappily committed himself. It is not our intention to take any trouble to rebut a charge which every body who wishes to know the truth may learn to be wickedly false, by opening any Catholic Catechism, or questioning any Catholic child he may meet in the street. If men like the writer before us will persist in disseminating such manifest calumnies, they must answer for their conduct at the tribunal of God. They have light enough. May their eyes be opened ere it be too late!

We turn to a more interesting question, viz. what reasons seem to have existed against an earlier introduction of what are now commonly meant by images. We have said that no Catholic is concerned to maintain the contrary proposition, nor *primâ facie* is such a proposition, in our opinion, probable, independently of historical testimony. Thrown as the Church was into the midst of a world filled with the grossest superstition and idolatry, its first work necessarily was to unsensualise and immaterialise, or at least to *un-humanise*, the idea of God which every where prevailed; to teach mankind that He was a pure and ineffable Spirit, without body, parts, or passions, invisible and incomprehensible. The Unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of Persons, and the reality of the Incarnation; all these great mysteries were to be constantly presented before men's minds, and deeply inculcated upon them, before it were safe to allow visible and material representations of Him who is the object of adoration, except in the way of parable, type, or symbol. The unspiritualised mind, habituated to all the sensual, though it were poetical, imagery of Pagan worship, could not have profited by such representations, even as instruments for imparting instruction

of idolatry against the Church by first identifying the Catholic use of images with the Heathen use of idols, and then quoting the Fathers in this assumed sense. He actually accuses (p. 337) Catholics of "investing an image with some kind of divinity," and that in the face of an express statement to the contrary by the Council of Trent—a statement which every member of the Church is bound to hold and maintain as he would save his soul.

or moving the affections. Rather harm might have ensued. Accustomed to regard their idols as gods or demigods, or at least as in some way inhabited by divinity, there might have been danger lest, in their ignorance, not only the Heathen without, but the very catechumens of the Church should regard the images of Christ and of the saints with an absolute and idolatrous worship.* Or if their minds were speedily disabused of these gross material notions, yet there might have been reason to fear that they would look upon such representations as exhibiting the very nature and essence of God, and as embodying his divine attributes. Instead of symbolising the invisible God, or representing Him as incarnate, such images would have been taken to be the very *resemblance* of Him; instead of representing the true and very God made man, they would but have expressed their own false ideas of God;† in other words, they would, to their unenlightened or half-enlightened minds, have represented false gods, and this would have been idolatry. In short, until the inward idea or *imago* were formed in the mind, until they had embraced the belief in the true God, and learnt intellectually to conceive and in words to express it, it was not safe, as indeed it was not possible, to set up before the eyes of men visible images of Him whom they were to worship. They would but have transferred their own ideas to the image; and instead of representing the truth they were being taught, it would have stood in their minds for the old falsehood which they were beginning to unlearn.

Again, what scandal would such representations have caused the Jews, to whom the reverence paid to images would have looked like that idolatry to which they rightly attributed the calamities of their nation. Forbidden as they were, not only to make and worship idols, or strange gods, but to make any form or similitude (Deut. iv. 12-16) of the one true God, even the allegorising his divine Person, and much more the representing it in forms of wood and stone, would have been an abomination in their eyes, and a stumblingblock in the way of their conversion. They must first believe that God had taken flesh and appeared in "the likeness of men," ere they could endure to behold Him represented in human form, or regard with veneration an image of his Person.

* "That, as far as possible, they might not fall into the notion that images were gods."—Origen, quoted by Newman, *Essay on Development*, p. 357.

† This would be true of the philosophers and poets, and the educated classes generally, who despised the popular superstitions, and were free from the grosser forms of idolatry. Their ideas of God, at the highest, scarcely rose above the human.

In short, so long as reasons existed for the observance of the *disciplina arcani*,* and so long, therefore, as the uninitiated were ignorant of the sublime spirituality and real tenets of the Christian religion, it is obvious—whatever other causes operated to postpone or restrain the use of holy images, as afterwards introduced into the Church (and we are not denying that other causes were in operation)—it is obvious that the open and unreserved “cultus” of holy images was from the nature of the case impracticable.

Neither was it the natural expression of the mind of the Church at the time. The course of devotion, as of thought, cannot be forced; or if forced, the result is an exaggerated or an abortive development.† It is not natural for Christian devotion to do aught but follow or accompany in its acts and expressions the theological developments of the Church’s creed. It would not be natural for Christians to set up images of our Lord and his Blessed Mother, until the doctrine of the hypostatic union of the two natures in one person was not only implicitly believed, as it was from the first, but explicitly taught and insisted upon in all its consequences.‡

The history of Christian doctrine does indeed most marvellously illustrate this *primá-facie* view and expectation. No sooner has the incarnation of the Son of God been accurately defined and perfectly established in the Church, than “image-worship” is found to have attained a developed form; and the next assault which heresy essays is on the material representation of the God made man, and, by a necessary consequence, on that of his Blessed Mother and his Saints. And what is also most worthy of notice, the violence of ico-

* This will explain why in succeeding times, and ever since, even in the midst of heretics to whom the *cultus* of images is a scandal and an occasion of blasphemy and unbelief, no pains have been taken by the Church to hide her devotional practices in this respect. If Jews and Protestants are scandalised, it is (with whatever allowances for exceptional cases) through their own fault and culpable ignorance. Now *nothing* is concealed; all is made plain to those who will take the most ordinary trouble to understand what the Catholic religion really is.

† *Essay on Development*, p. 352. Thus the Carpocratians used images in a Pagan way, setting up the statue of Christ by the side of those of Plato, Pythagoras, &c.

‡ This will account for the Church’s placing no restrictions (except such as individual discretion may suggest) on her missionaries amongst the Heathen at the present day, as to the use of holy images, and other like objects and incentives to devotion. As she goes to them with her whole developed creed, so, of necessity, she does not withhold from them her corresponding devotional system. Her life is the counterpart of her Lord on earth. She cannot in her full stature shrink back within the compass of the form which she wore in her infant state. Her creed and her devotions are parts of one living whole. They are the complement one of the other. The two are inseparable. The only danger would lie in detracting from the full proportions of either.

noclasm breaks out in the very region which Satan had chosen as the battle-field on which to head his first onslaught against the faith of the Church of God. Defeated in all his direct attacks, he thought to regain the lost ground, and to undo the effect of the victories achieved against him, by a stroke as subtle as it was bold, viz. a seeming reverence and zeal for Christ, the integrity of his nature, and the orthodoxy of his worship. In the East had arisen all the heresies that assailed the divinity and the humanity of Christ, and the East is the stronghold of iconoclasm.

No one can read, however cursorily, the history of the contest respecting images without perceiving that what both parties considered that the question at issue turned upon, was the reality of the incarnation. The controversy was not, as Protestants say, about the honour and worship essentially due to God, but the honour and worship appropriately due to an *Incarnate* God, to Him who at the same time was both God and man. This, we repeat, was the question in dispute, at least at the origin of the contest: seeing that Christ is God as well as man, is it pious to make an image of Him, as He is? and granting that it is so, may worship be rendered there-to? and again, if so, of what kind ought that worship to be? The anti-Catholic party in the East began by allowing, or rather by maintaining, that images might be used religiously, and, indeed, honoured as from a distance, but that they ought not to be superstitiously worshipped. They would admit images into churches, but they would have them "set up on high" out of the reach of the people, who were wont to kiss them and salute them with prostrations and genuflexions, so "bringing a scandal upon things otherwise worthy of honour."* But the real design of these reformers was not long in shewing itself; and from removing the holy Crucifix and the images of Christ and the Saints from their usual places, and prohibiting all honour to be shewn them, they soon took to banishing them from the churches altogether, and treating them with ignominy and outrage. Impiety speedily reached its climax; the hypocrisy of antichrist needed no longer its cloak of affected zeal.

What good men from the first felt to be the real object of attack is evident from the noble words of Germanus, the vener-

* This in the first instance was Leo's proposition. Mr. Mendham calls the Emperor's view of the matter "both moderate, pious, and rational," yet he himself, in almost every page of his work, denounces the very presence of images in churches as an idolatrous thing, and his own Church has cast them out as abominable.

able Patriarch of Constantinople, to the Emperor Leo, in which he declared that "he would willingly die for the sake of His image, who, to restore the lost image of God in man, had rendered up his life upon the cross."* The whole argument of the aged saint, as it has come down to us in the narratives of historians, is worth extracting, because it shews the ground that was at once taken by the defenders of images before the issue proved the real bearing and importance of the contest, and is an evidence of the theological depth of the Catholic disputants, which is most illustriously in contrast with the shallowness and inconsistency of their adversaries. It must naturally occur to any mind to which the Incarnation is a reality, that the very fact of God becoming man must make *all* the difference in the matter of representing Him in visible human form. Even had He but *appeared* as man, the very semblance of humanity which He wore would have seemed to justify the representing of it; but seeing that He had taken human nature in its very substance, corporeal and incorporeal, no objection in the very nature of things could lie against making pictures, and if pictures then by analogy statues also of Him. St. Germanus is reported to have said that

"He was far indeed from worshipping images in the manner in which the triune God alone ought to be adored. But every kind of προσκύνησις did not imply such adoration. In the Old Testament, worship was spoken of as a mere outward sign of veneration. In this sense it may be rendered to man; and is actually given to the emperors, to their statues and edicts, and without ever bringing on those who render it the charge of idolatry. Of the invisible essence of God, it was plain that no image could be made, and the attempt, therefore, according to the Old Testament, must be forbidden. But since God has become manifest in human nature, and has taken it into union with Himself, so ought we now, agreeably to our faith in the true humanity of the Son of God, to make images of the God-man. The representation of Christ in such images may be made not less edifying than a verbal description† of that great mystery of

* Neander's *Church History*, Dr. Stebbing's translation, vol. v. p. 264. Mr. Mendham, misunderstanding the whole drift of the passage, acutely observes, "How can a man be his own image?"

† This idea is thus expanded by Leibnitz: "Granting, then, that no other veneration of images is admitted but such as belongs to the prototype, there will be no more idolatry in it than in the veneration which is rendered to God and to Christ when his most holy name is uttered. For names are also signs, and such indeed as are far inferior to images, inasmuch as they represent a thing much less perfectly. Therefore, when an image is said to be honoured, this is not to be understood in any other way than when it is said, that 'In the name of Jesus every knee should bow,' 'Blessed be the name of the Lord,' 'Glory be to His name;' and to worship before an external image is not more to be reprehended

the incarnation, and is an actual rejection of Docetism. It is not the earthly material of which the image is made which receives the honour, but the incarnate Deity which it represents. Neither to the Mother of God, however, nor to the Saints, in reference to their persons, ought any kind of adoration (*λατρεία*) to be offered. This belongs to God alone; but to the Mother of God, as to her through whom the Most High became a partaker of humanity, to her who was thereby exalted in rank above all other creatures, proportionable honour and love are due."*

St. John of Damascus expresses himself in similar terms:

"Christians who have attained to maturity of the faith possess the means of distinguishing between what can be represented and what is far exalted above the power of representation. Under the old covenant it was impossible that God, as an incorporeal being and without form, should be represented by any image. But now that God has appeared in the flesh, and has conversed with men upon earth, I may represent Him according to his visible appearance."†

And so he continues in the same strain. The Popes Gregory and Adrian hold precisely the same language, and in like manner all the arguments alleged by the Fathers of the

than to worship before an internal image, figured in our imagination; for the use of an external image is none other than to give a more distinct expression to the internal image."—*Syst. Theol.* quoted by Perrone, *Prælectiones, Tract. de cult. Sanct.* cap. v.

Blanco White saw clearly that the use of images was involved in the belief of an incarnate God. His words have a most painful interest. He says: "A religion which presents an *incarnate* God as the supreme object of worship is essentially idolatrous. Idolatry does not consist in worshipping *material figures*, but in reducing the Deity to an object of the *imagination*. If God is made man, it signifies little whether you worship the *image within you*, or whether you represent that image in wood or stone, according to the Roman Catholic practice. It is childish to make the evil of idolatry consist in the materiality of the idol; that evil arises from the inevitable degradation of the Deity, when conceived as a *man*." (*Autobiography*, quoted by the *Christian Remembrancer*, No. xlix. p. 190.) The remarks with which the reviewer accompanies this extract, and indeed the whole essay, are very suggestive. We know at least one instance in which the train of thought thus opened, led to the embrace of the whole doctrine of the Catholic Church on the subject of images, disclosing, as it did, the intimacy of the connexion that subsisted between the *cultus imaginum* and the mystery of the incarnation, nay, the very personality of God, as revealed to us through a "human medium."

* Neander, vol. v. pp. 263, 4. The whole account of the contest about images given by this writer is very instructive. Caring nothing for creeds and dogmas, he is remarkably clear-sighted in detecting the inconsistencies of the anti-Catholic party. We cannot say that we consider this a mark of candour in him, because, although making the greatest admissions where he has no motive to the contrary, in every thing that clashes with his own opinions he exhibits a partiality and unfairness quite as remarkable. Mr. M. despising, like all shallow men, what he cannot understand, talks of Germanus' "prosy" reply.

† Neander, vol. v. pp. 267, 8.

Council start from the same idea—the essential difference between the old dispensation and the new, God having now manifested Himself to men. This unanimity is very remarkable. Even the ground taken by the opposite side in the pseudo-Council of Constantinople was that of a supposed denial, by implication, of the mystery of the twofold nature of Christ; while in fact they themselves used the most unorthodox reasonings on the subject, involving no less (as we shall see in the sequel) than the denial that “Jesus Christ was come in the flesh.” But we must reserve the discussion to our next number, as also the consideration of what to our minds are the three most interesting questions connected with the whole matter, viz. 1. what was the object and the result of the appeal which the Fathers of the Council made to tradition, with respect to the use and veneration of images? 2. what was the species of veneration, or worship, which the Council prescribed? and 3. what is the nature of the developments which the doctrine has received by analytical process at the hands of later divines?

THE CHURCH AND THE KING BEFORE AND AFTER THE REFORMATION.

The Present Crisis in the Church of England. Illustrated by a brief Inquiry as to the Royal Supremacy before and after the Reformation. By W. J. Irons, B.D., Vicar of Brompton. Masters.

If there be any thing that is certain about Christianity, looked upon as a mere fact in the history of mankind, it is, that it has ever claimed a power independent of the temporal government. It sprang up entirely apart from any existing commonwealth; its propagators, while they owned allegiance to “the powers that be,” every where excepted from the jurisdiction of the civil ruler all that concerned their religion. The existence of martyrs is a sufficient proof of this. Nor was this the case only while the powers of the world were Pagan. St. Athanasius considers it quite a sufficient condemnation of an Arian creed that it bore the date of a consulate, and was stamped with the sanction of an emperor. And this, be it observed, is the indispensable condition of what claims to be a divine revelation. It must erect itself over every earthly power by the

very fact that it pretends to come from Heaven : if it is to obtain a hearing at all, it must present itself as something utterly beyond every thing which belongs to the mere natural order of things. This is so palpable, that whenever religion is vital it at once pours out its strong energetic life in a struggle with the powers of the world. The sturdy Covenanters who bared their bosoms to the sword of Claverhouse, the early Wesleyans, and the many sects who have opposed the State, are only various developments of this great principle. It is true, indeed, that while these religionists claim our sympathy as asserters of a great truth, they are on the other hand pushed into a false position by the fact that they are sectaries. The State may turn round upon them and say, "It is all very well to claim liberty of thought on the ground of your believing that your tenets come from heaven; but before we let you teach and preach, you must shew us by what authority you claim to come from God. Till then, you are a simple nuisance, and we will put you down with fine and imprisonment; we will make war upon you with pains and penalties, as we do upon every one else who disturbs the public peace." The fact is, these enthusiastic men are labouring under the fallacy common to all who pretend to teach religious truth without pretending to infallibility. Before claiming exemption from legitimate authority, they must not only believe in a revelation, but also be the authorised teachers of it. Otherwise, they may be mistaken about the truth of the particular form of the religion which they profess. If they have no divine authority to teach, they simply come under the laws of the police, if once they break them. The very mistake, however, of these sects bears witness to the great truth, that revelation which claims to be genuine must necessarily possess powers beyond the jurisdiction of the State. This, of course, is the justification of the Apostles; they were infallible, that is, they were the authorised depositories of heavenly truth; therefore, woe to whoever came across them. This it is which raises their death to the dignity of martyrdom, above that of a common execution. This it is which authorised them, fishermen as they were, to organise a body beside and beyond the State, to map out the world into dioceses, and to give certain individuals jurisdiction over populous cities, and over vast tracts of territory. If Christianity is to be a revelation at all, it must be independent of secular princes; in other words, its normal condition must be a complete distinction of Church and State.

Now if there be such a thing as historical truth, this state

of things was realised in the middle ages, and in this country ceased to exist at the Reformation. Before the sixteenth century, the Church claimed to be the Christian revelation, because it had power from Christ to teach the truth. The State bowed to it, not only because it was Christian, but because being infallible it was Christianity. After that period, all forms of religion, save one, rushed into a state of rebellion or of servitude. Each body of Christians separated from the Catholic Church generated either rebels or slaves. Each view of the Christian republic had its advantages: unbounded liberty of thought fell to the share of the religionist who held that he might believe and teach what he pleased independently of the State; peace, and quiet, and uniformity were, or ought to have been, enjoyed by the sects who preferred a religion of which the State was the arbiter.

Now, of these two alternatives the strong worldly sense of England chose the latter. Its appreciation of dogmatic truth has never been so vivid as its reverence for law and palpable authority. During the various changes of religion in the reigns of Henry, of Edward, and of Elizabeth, it lay still. Sometimes it was goaded into rebellion, as when on a given day, by Act of Parliament, the cold, dead service of the Prayer-book shoved aside the holy sacrifice of the Mass. Even the soothing exhortation in the beginning of the service did not lull the men of England to sleep, and they rushed to arms. Their remonstrances were, however, first cajoled into silence, and then choked in blood; and England again relapsed into patience. It would hardly seem to be possible to deny that the State did most thoroughly and entirely absorb into itself every power of the Church which implied a government over souls, or an independent faculty of teaching. History is the most awkward of arguments. It is a palpable fact, that all along, ever since its origin under Henry VIII., the Anglican Establishment has surrendered its authority into the hands of the State. What is passing around us now might be supposed to be a sufficient evidence of this assertion. With the Gorham case before him, he would be a bold man who would say that the Church of England was as free as it was in the days of St. Anselm and St. Thomas.

Yet, strange to say,—and after this long preamble, we are at last arriving at the subject of our article,—a man has been found, we will not say impudent, but courageous enough to affirm that the Establishment in the nineteenth century enjoys more freedom than the medieval Church in the days of St. Gregory and of Innocent III. And this courage is the more

meritorious, because the author of the theory in question does not profess to base it upon abstract metaphysical grounds, but appeals to a species of argument in which error is most easily detected. Mr. Irons has undertaken to shew from history that "the Church for five hundred years before the Reformation, by countless acts of synods and parliaments, sometimes together, sometimes apart, did recognise, and as a habit allow, the supremacy of the king;" that "the spirit of the Reformation was altogether hostile to the royal supremacy;" nay, that "the reformed Church somewhat abated and restrained the royal prerogative." Now it might be supposed that to state such a proposition was to refute it. It should never, however, be forgotten that in such a controversy as the present, where men are struggling for life and death, any argument on the side which they love is sufficient to dazzle and perplex them. A drowning man catches at any thing; and many a sincere Anglican who is still clinging with the strong grasp of misplaced affection to the system in which he was born, may clutch at the very palpable straw which Mr. Irons has flung upon the troubled waters of the Gorham controversy. Nay, there are traces of a line of argument very similar to that adopted by the gentleman in question to be found in a letter,* which, as indicated by the well-known signature, E. B. P., can only come from a person by no means uninfluential in the party to which he belongs. It is therefore a mere act of charity to examine into the historical grounds adduced by Mr. Irons in support of his assertion.

And now, in order to narrow as much as possible the field of our inquiries, we would try to reduce them as much as possible to a pure matter of fact. Let us attempt to strip it of all abstractions, and draw it down as far as we can into the region of things purely visible. The word "Church," for instance, may perplex us; as far, therefore, as this question is concerned, the supremacy of the Church may be considered to mean the supremacy of the clergy. In the middle ages, there existed two bodies of men as distinct as any thing could possibly be, the clergy and the laity. If you had walked the streets of medieval London, you would have easily picked out the one from the other by the difference in their external appearance; and yet the shaven crown and the cassock of the priest would not more infallibly have distinguished him from the mail-clad warrior, than the social condition of the one would have marked him out from the other. It is true, you might sometimes have found certain individuals who might have come across your division; you might occasionally have seen a bishop, like him

* *Guardian*, March 20.

of Beauvais, wielding the iron mace, and clothed in a soldier's armour; yet this would by no means disturb you, for all England would at once see the incongruity, just as if now the Archbishop of Canterbury were made Earl-Marshal of the realm. If you had looked further into the matter, you would have seen that in certain matters the churchman had power over the layman; the clergy, by their authorised organs, were the acknowledged expositors of the faith, and the administrators of a system of morals coming from God, and called Christianity. And from this immediately arose their jurisdiction; that is, they not only pronounced that such a false doctrine was heresy, but they moreover judged that the man who held it was a heretic. They not only pronounced upon the abstract validity of marriages in certain cases, but they declared that the union of definite persons living as married was valid or null as the case might be; in other words, they had jurisdiction over those persons. Again, all government implies the power to punish offenders; and the Church had powers vested in her, by which she could inflict penalties of a spiritual nature upon those who despised her authority. Lastly, in order to the free exercise of her influence on the social body, it was necessary for the Church to shew a legitimate control over the appointment of her own officers. In these three things, therefore, consisted the power of the Church: its authority in deciding in cases of dogma or of morals, involving jurisdiction over heretics and certain moral delinquents; its power in the infliction of ecclesiastical censures; and its freedom in the election of its Bishops, and the distribution of benefices among its priests.

On the other hand, it must be remembered, that clear and definite as was this idea of the separation between Church and State, in practice the two bodies were so blended together that innumerable questions arose between them. First of all, they were materially identical, that is, the self-same individuals entered into the composition of both societies. The churchman was a subject in temporal matters, as the layman was a member of the Church in what concerned his soul. Again, the Church possessed property, and thus became a portion of the feudal commonwealth. When a bishopric was conferred, or a benefice given, not only was jurisdiction acquired over souls, but certain broad lands also fell under the dominion of the churchman. Thus the State, as lord of the soil, might naturally have a voice in the election to ecclesiastical dignities; and thus a certain debateable ground was created, leaving room for concession on the part of the Church, and usurpation on the side of the State.

And now, over and above this slight sketch, must come one thing more, without which the whole would be incomplete. We are told that "appeals elsewhere" are no part of ecclesiastical polity.* But in that little mysterious 'elsewhere' is contained a word which the pen refused to write, and the lips durst not speak, because it could neither be spoken nor written without heart-burning. By the grace of God, appeals to Rome were a part of the Church polity of the middle ages; and in this lies the gist of the whole question. Kings might usurp, and Bishops might truckle; but as long as throughout the length and breadth of the land every Englishman knew quite well, that across the British Channel, ay, and across the Alps, there sat an old man, and he a churchman, who had power from God to settle the whole matter, the heart of England was still sound, and unimpaired by vital disease. William Rufus might storm, and synods be silenced, but all England knew that it was an act of brute-force, nay, the Red King knew it himself quite well, and if God had given him grace to repent before he was struck down like a wild beast by the fatal arrow, he would have confessed it as a sin before he died; and when Anselm came into his presence-chamber, and begged him to allow Councils to be called in England as of old, and the king answered, that the matter depended on the royal will, and not on the archbishop's, then the old man quietly wended his way to Rome, in spite of the king, sat as Archbishop in the Council of Bari, and pronounced on the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost. And this, be it remembered, is a fact quite independent of all questions about the jurisdiction of the see of Rome. The simple question is, did the final appeal in ecclesiastical causes lie with a churchman or with a layman in the middle ages? and the answer is, that, as a matter of fact, the ultimate referee in such cases was an ecclesiastic, who, by the ordinance of Christ, as we believe, was the successor of St. Peter. There might be usurpation on the part of the State, and connivance on the side of the Church, but all the world knew what it meant. Concordats might be entered into, and concessions made, but they all proceeded on the assumption that the parties concerned were independent sovereigns, and that the conceding party was giving what was his,—in other words, that he was the supreme fountain of jurisdiction in the matters in question.

With the light thus thrown on the subject before us, let us enter briefly on the examination of the facts brought forward by Mr. Irons. Of course it may be said that the state of things in question was the theory of the middle ages, but that, in point of

* Vide Letter from E. B. P. in the *Guardian*.

fact, the Church was unable to carry it out. Now we are perfectly ready to acknowledge that the State, in many instances, did encroach upon the Church, nay, that churchmen connived often at what they disliked; but we maintain that the ecclesiastical polity which we describe was realised and did exist as a mighty truth. We maintain that the fact is so palpable that it requires no proof from us; the *onus probandi* lies with them who deny it. Now let us see how Mr. Irons attempts to establish his point.

He begins with William the Conqueror. Now we will translate for him the passage of Eadmer to which he most probably alludes: "He did not choose that any man in all his realm should acknowledge any one created Bishop of Rome as lawful Pope, except by his leave; nor would he suffer his letters to be received unless he himself had first inspected them. If the Archbishop of Canterbury convened a general synod of bishops and presided in it, he suffered him not to decree or to prohibit any thing which was not consonant with his will, and first put by himself among his ordinances. He never allowed his bishops publicly to bring to trial, or excommunicate, or bind with any ecclesiastical penalty, any one of his barons or ministers, be it for incest, or adultery, or any other capital crime."* As an instance of William's usurpations, the pamphlet goes on to say:—

"One of the offences of Archbishop Stigand, for which King William, of his royal authority, called a council and deposed him, was, that he had received his pall from a Pope whom the king of England disapproved—viz. Benedict IX. (a pontiff who was cast down from his popedom for simony): King William henceforth prohibited the English Church from acknowledging any one as Pope till the king had first done so. The king was obeyed, and the Church survived."

Now King William did not call a council, nor did he depose Stigand, nor was Stigand deposed because he received his pall from a Pope whom the king of England disapproved. He was degraded by two cardinal legates, in a council convoked by them, for having bought the pall from Benedict X., an antipope.† The king of England no doubt disapproved of Benedict, for we never heard that any body approved of him except a certain obscure Count of Tusculum; but there is no

* Hist. Nov. lib. i.

† "Willelmus Stigandus per cardinales Romanos deponi passus est." William of Malmesbury, *Gest.* lib. 3. "Stigandus per cardinales degradatus." Tol. lib. 2. But the clearest account of the transaction is contained in these words: "Ermenfridus, legatus Alexandri Papæ ad voluntatem regis, coacto concilio deposuit."—*De Pont.* lib. i.

proof that our king committed himself to any special act with respect to him, still less that this was the cause of Stigand's degradation. We quite allow that William was exceedingly glad to get rid of this worthless archbishop, if only because he was a Saxon; still, in this instance he can be accused of nothing uncanonical, nay, the account which he himself always gave of the matter was, that he was deposed by apostolic authority. Now we will allow Mr. Irons that the Conqueror, in the beginning of his reign, did perpetrate many an act against the liberties of the Church. Nay, he did call a council, in which he deposed bishops and abbots, in violation of all ecclesiastical law. He committed excesses enough of this sort to justify Eadmer's severe strictures upon his character; but the question is, how far he *succeeded* in his attempts upon ecclesiastical liberties? Happily there was that blessed successor of St. Peter, sitting at Rome, with his eye fixed upon England; and happily Hildebrand was standing by his side, as chancellor of the Holy See. Soon after the council to which we have been alluding, in which the Bishop of Chichester had been unlawfully deposed, there arrived a significant letter from Alexander, containing the following passage: "Besides, we would have your Excellency know that the cause of Alric, Bishop of Chichester, who was deposed by the substitutes of our legates, does not appear to us to have been completely handled as it ought. Therefore, as is provided in the canons, we have pronounced that he shall be restored. We have therefore committed his cause to be tried and determined by our brother Archbishop Lanfranc, according to the rule of canonical tradition."* William was far too wise a man to quarrel with either the Holy See or with Lanfranc. The fact is, that he was, after all, the most respectable of the crowned savages who then ruled over Europe. His interests also accorded with those of the Church. He certainly deposed Saxon bishops and abbots in a very summary manner; they were however, generally speaking, exceedingly disgraceful ecclesiastics, so that the Church was completely cleansed in his days. Thus Lanfranc overlooked the uncanonical proceedings which had taken place, and did not reverse what William had done unless the thing in itself was unjust, in which case he had recourse to Rome.—Again:

"King Henry I., in a council which he summoned at London," according to Mr. Irons, "took the power into his own hands of managing the law of clerical celibacy. The bishops acquiesced; and his majesty issued, it is said, his own royal licenses for the married priests."

* Baronius in Ann.

Now, first of all be it observed, that kings very often summoned the bishops of the realm together; or else the bishops themselves took occasion of their assembling in Parliament to transact ecclesiastical business together. It does not, however, in the least follow that these assemblies were councils, unless the bishops canonically converted themselves into a council. In France a distinct name was given to these assemblies in order to distinguish them from really ecclesiastical synods.* In England, however, these two sorts of meetings are often confounded, especially as the word 'council' was used for the common lay assemblies of the realm;† the attentive observer will generally be able to find out, from the form in which they are mentioned, whether the gathering in question was a real council or not. For instance, when it is said that "a great council was held in the palace of King Henry, in the year of our Lord 1107, on the first of August, under the presidency of the king, with the Archbishops Anselm of Canterbury and Gerard of York assisting,"‡ it is quite evident that the council was not ecclesiastical in the technical sense. When, on the contrary, "William Archbishop of Canterbury gathered together a general council of all the bishops and abbots, and all sorts of religious personages of the whole of England, over which council he himself presided as Archbishop of Canterbury and legate of the Apostolic See," there is no question whatever as to the nature of that assembly. Whether, however, the council cited by Mr. Irons was ecclesiastical or not, Henry did not take into his own hands the power of managing the law of clerical celibacy, nor is it said "that his majesty issued his own royal licenses for the married priests." The history to which allusion is made is as follows. The ecclesiastics against whom the law was made could not be judged in the secular courts. The wily Beauchamp, however, offered to use the secular arm for the punishment of the wretched offenders; the bishops, forgetting with whom they had to deal, allowed him to do so, on which he exacted heavy fines, and after putting the gold into his own royal exchequer, suffered the miserable beings to remain as they were.§ To receive as a boon from the bishops leave to punish with the civil power priests living in that dreadful state, is by no means equivalent to taking in one's hands the law of ecclesiastical celibacy; nor can the bishops be said to have acquiesced, for it is as clear as possible that they did not concede that which Henry did.

* Thomassin *Vet. et nova Ecc. Disc.* p. 2, lib. iii. c. 56.

† "Magnum concilium," in our historians, commonly means "parliament."

‡ *Chronicle of Battle Abbey* ap. Wilkins.

§ "Concessere regi justitiam de focariis sacerdotum." Wilkins, l. 4, 11.

And now, from this insignificant piece of by-play, disgraceful enough to the cunning deceiver, and matter enough for shame to the deceived, yet unworthy of being put forward in the great battle of the middle ages we approach, a far other scene comes before us, in which it would be difficult to suppose that any one could be bold enough to find an instance of kingly supremacy. When a man evokes the spirit of St. Thomas of Canterbury, and bids it tell him how the king in his day enslaved the Church in England, it is really a compliment to call him ignorant, save that there is in theology a species of ignorance called "affected."

It may be, and we hope it is so, that Mr. Irons is only a man who dips here and there into history, and thus has no thread to guide him through the labyrinth of dates and facts before him. Men who start on a false hypothesis, or else start on no principle at all, are often confused by the multitude of regal figures and stately forms marshalled before them in history, and mistake the bearings of their actions one upon another. But when an unquestionable and palpable shape, like that of St. Thomas, comes up before a man, even Christian charity can hardly call a blunder any thing but wilful. It would be useless to speak of it, if it were not for the sake of illustrating the principles which we have in view through the whole of this rough sketch. The council, or rather assembly, of Clarendon, is no proof of the king's supremacy in England, though every bishop in the realm, with the two archbishops at their head, gave up into the hands of the State some of the fundamental powers of the Church; because every episcopal voice, as it pleaded for the fatal document, trembled, for the heart whispered that it was doing foul wrong, and that, do what they might, their act was worth nothing as long as Alexander III. had not stamped the fisherman's seal upon it. The Church, in the person of its head, and he a churchman, had still to pronounce upon the question; and therefore lay supremacy had not prevailed. Again, England had not apostatised, because every man in the realm knew that the Pope was over all, and acknowledged his right to settle the matter. Public opinion, after all, is the criterion of the fact, whether a triumph has been gained or not; it cannot pronounce on the matter of right or of doctrine; but if you have won it over to your side, you have at least beaten the antagonist principle. Now St. Thomas learned what England thought of what he had done the moment that he left the council. A murmur arose among his own attendants: as he rode on his way, with his cross borne before him, he who carried the sacred sign murmured that the shepherd had deserted

his sheep, and given them over to the wolf; that the kings and princes of the earth had been gathered together against the Lord Christ, and that the synagogue of Satan was raging against Him. These were plain words; and from that hour St. Thomas wept bitterly. The seal of Canterbury was never set to that scroll of parchment which he had carried away unsigned from the council-chamber; and after many years, in which that noble heart was trained in the interior life—in all its sorrows, under his rough director the Cistercian Abbot, who understood him not; in all its transports, when Mary appeared and tutored him in her sevenfold joys,—then, ripe for martyrdom, he returned and washed away the constitutions of Clarendon for ever in his blood.

And now we will follow the rash steps of Mr. Irons through another phase of the contest. The kings of England had learned a lesson from the utter failure of Henry II.'s systematic attempts upon the liberties of the Church: they no longer ventured on more than isolated acts of tyranny, especially in impeding the freedom of elections. On one of these instances Mr. Irons has fallen; but if he had asked us, we would have furnished him with at least six more in the space of about twenty years, up to the time when St. Richard's election to the see of Chichester gave a severe check to the king's usurpations. The instance, however, of Walter de Hemesham is a most unfortunate one. The pamphlet before us says, "the king refused to confirm him, and set him aside, and the Church submitted to the royal will." The Church, however, did no such thing; the bishops as well as the king opposed his election, and the cause was decided, not by the secular power, but at Rome. Walter was examined by the Cardinals, and set aside on the ground of want of theological knowledge. Again, in the other cases which we might bring forward of royal interference in elections, the cause was almost invariably carried to Rome; each case, therefore, is an evidence against royal supremacy.

If we continued, step by step, to expose the mistakes made by Mr. Irons, this article would run to a most disproportionate length; we will therefore only notice one more *en passant* before proceeding to the only remaining portion of his pamphlet which really bears, in any important degree, on the history of the ante-reformation Church.

"In the reign of Edward II. it was enacted by parliament, and allowed by the Church, that 'when a case is debated before judges spiritual and temporal, notwithstanding the spiritual judgment, the king's court shall discuss the same matter as it shall deem expedient.'"

The meaning of this clause is simply as follows: supposing any one laid violent hands on a clerk in the king's highway, he would be amenable to the ecclesiastical court, and at the same time had broken the public peace, and so was also to appear before the secular tribunal. The king's judges, according to the statute in question, might punish or acquit him, whatever might have been the judgment of the ecclesiastical officers. How this affects the liberties of the Church it is difficult to discover. In fact, the most cursory examination of the document in question shews clearly, that it was made, on the whole, in favour of ecclesiastics.

This brings us well into the middle of the 14th century, a wretched time, in which we fully grant that the spirit of the Reformation began to gain ground in England. If ever there was a melancholy time for the Church, it was during these two centuries preceding the Reformation. The deep melancholy song of Dante, turning to the other world for an explanation of the power of evil over good, is the fitting intellectual expression of it. Its opening scene is the captivity of the Pope, when the poet saw "the *fleur de lis* enter into Anagni, and Christ again a prisoner in the person of his Vicar."* On the continent, there were at least St. Catherine of Sienna yearning, with a woman's love, for the Pope's return to Rome, St. Vincent Ferrer announcing the coming of the judgment, and St. Bernardin spreading the triumph of the name of Jesus. But as for England, its line of saints closes; it is the age of Wicliff, that man of the North, *homo borealis*, as Walsingham calls him, who first breathed in English ears views of nationality. The statute of *præmunire* is the product of this century. Let no one suppose that it had any thing to do with doctrine. Wicliff's Manichæism, and his theories of society, secular and ecclesiastical, fell dead; but the solid and practical view that money was going out of the land to enrich foreigners, whenever the sovereign Pontiff gave a benefice to the churchmen of his court, found many a ready listener. This statute is nothing more than the expression of a deep English growl, as gold was seen to flow from the land into Italian pockets. But its history is not to be gathered from the statute-book. It remained there, and was brought forth as it was needed; but it was an understood thing that a concordat was still pending between the Pontiff and the king on the subject. Edward III., when his parliament pressed him to proceed in the matter, stopped their petitions by saying that he was in treaty with the court of Rome. Every Bishop received his bulls from Rome, notwithstanding *præmunire*,

* Purg. cant. xx.

though with a protest, that by this act he meant nothing against the king's majesty. Nay, though the statute forbade appeals concerning benefices to be carried to the papal court, several causes of that nature were decided there. For instance, Thomas Arundel was deprived of and reinstated in the Archbishopric of Canterbury, in the teeth of the statute;* and the bishopric of Lincoln was given away by the Pope in 1396, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the clergy of England. The fact is, that churchmen were just as much opposed to papal provisions; but neither party ever dreamed of the use which afterwards was made of it. This poor statute of *præmunire* did a great work in the hands of Henry VIII.; but it was a brute machine which borrowed its force from the determined arm which wielded it.

Never were a set of men more aghast than the clergy of England when they found themselves in the very fangs of the wondrous statute; but they stared still more wildly when it was announced to them that they could only escape by declaring that Henry was "the protector and only supreme head of the church and clergy of England." We will not go through the miserable tale. With a paltry "*quantum per legem Christi liceat*," it was carried, and the king and clergy kissed and made friends. And from that moment a new order of things began in the realm. It was one day in January 1591 that the deed was done; and the morrow's sun rose upon England, and found it on the highway to schism. They were Catholics of course who had done it, just as every step by which a man proceeds on his way to mortal sin is taken by him in a state of grace. Nor do we say that England ceased to be Catholic at that moment, nor is it possible perhaps to lay one's finger on the precise moment when she was cut off from the Church of Christ; Cranmer himself got his bulls from Rome; but in that Convocation-chamber was averred a principle which was the very reverse of Catholicism, which differs from it as much as Mahomedanism does from Christianity, and which is the doctrine of the Church of England, the heresy which infects it, and which it makes it death to remain in her bosom.

And now we will beg leave to forget Mr. Irons; he has teased and bored us up to this time, and now we bid him good-by, only warning him, for the future, off historical ground. But there are other minds in the Anglican Establishment, more earnest and more religious, who may dream that they may remain there without acknowledging the principle involved in the royal supremacy. It is for them that we

* Thomassin, 2. lib. 2, 34.

now shew, that it is not a mere assumption on the part of the State, but a dogma, or rather the distinctive dogma, of the Church of England. Every society has got an idea or type on which it is formed, and the idea on which the Anglican Church proceeds is that the ruler of the state is its head, the fountain of its jurisdiction, and an integral part, and that the dominant one, of all its functions. And the way to ascertain this is simply to investigate its actual history, as in the case of all bodies politic whatever. If divines of utterly different schools have held it in some shape or another, if it be the key to its whole life, so that every phase through which it has gone is only a development of this one idea, then surely it is not an usurpation, it is the *doctrine* of the Church. Historical development is the most unerring guide that can be followed; it does not proceed in a regular march like a documentary argument; its order is often inverted; but the stern conclusion, which might have been prophesied from the beginning, is sure to come at last. It is evolved not through one mind, but through thousands; it seizes like a spirit on a whole nation; it possesses it, and all its writhings and struggles are nothing but the spasmodic action caused by the mighty influence.

Now, it might be supposed to be hard to fix on one formula which could include within it every party within the capacious bosom of the English Church. Yet we believe that there is one principle which comprehends them all, from the followers of Dr. Pusey down to the lowest churchman, and that is, the principle of nationality. All hold that each national Church is perfect within itself, and has all that is necessary for the life of a Church. Sick or sorry it may be without its sister-churches, but still it is alive, that is, it has all that is essential to it apart from them, just as two sisters are perfect and independent beings, and have two souls and two responsibilities. Now, it is out of this principle of nationality that has been generated the idea of the royal supremacy. You will never persuade Englishmen that any body politic can go on without a court of final appeal; now, where, in point of fact, is this court of appeal, if, as on the hypothesis it must be, it is to be within the nation? Talk not of the Catholic Church; no man will ever persuade the world that the Church within the nation is the Universal Church in such a sense as to be a *final* authority from God to decide cases of doctrine. Nay, did any one ever assert it? The Bishops may differ, and whither are you to carry your appeal from discordant Bishops? To the primitive Church? But the Church of St. Ambrose and St. Augustine will not deprive a

clergyman of the 19th century of his living for heresy, any more than it can institute him. For be it remembered, that jurisdiction, that is, the power of carrying out the laws upon individuals, is a present thing, and you cannot call the saints from their graves to exercise it. Again, in the ecclesiastical matters, the power of pronouncing upon doctrine, and that of judging a matter of fact, are identical. You cannot judge this man to be a heretic, without judging his doctrine to be heresy; so that, if the national Church be not able of itself to pronounce upon doctrine, apart from the rest of the Catholic Church, it cannot have jurisdiction in itself to condemn an individual as a teacher of error. No, you will never convince England that the Church of the English nation, as separate from the rest of the Christian Church, is an authoritative judge of doctrine. This opinion never was mooted at the time of the Reformation; it never was asserted since by any one that we ever heard of. If, then, the national Church be separated from the rest of Christendom, and if, being thus separated, it does not contain within itself all that is necessary to be the final court of appeal, where are you to look for your ultimate tribunal? The Church and nation of England at the Reformation answered: In the king. And from that day to this, under various modifications, so it has been.

This answer, as given by the Parliament of England, was of course definite enough; it declared "that the archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical but by and from his majesty."* Let us now trace the progress of this theory in the ecclesiastical mind of England. Clear and explicit as are the words of the statute-book, the view is not less clear when it takes the shape of a dogma in the hands of theologians. Cranmer held as a doctrine, that the Apostles themselves only ordained bishops and priests because the emperor was a Heathen, and his ecclesiastical authority was in abeyance.† Thus St. Peter, according to this successor of St. Thomas of Canterbury, was therefore Nero's vicar, save that the emperor was prevented by the accident of Paganism from entering on his office, just as a king may be suspended in the exercise of his functions by lunacy or sickness. It was impossible, however, that the theory should remain in such a state as that; and Queen Elizabeth felt it. She put out an admonition, complaining bitterly of those "malicious persons" who gave out "that the kings and queens of the realm challenge au-

* 37 Hen. VIII. c. 17.

† Questions and Answers on the Sacraments. Jenkyns, vol. ii. p. 98.

thority and power of ministry of divine service in the Church." She only claimed "the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her dominions, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them." Now no one doubted her sovereignty over ecclesiastical persons, the question was whether she was supreme over them in spiritual matters; and her divines settled for her that she was. It was in her reign that the Church of England proper was established. Before then, amidst the wild revolutionary work of the Reformation, how could any man stop to elaborate theories? They seized on the first that came; each man in the midst of the great battle, conscious only of the fundamental principle which he felt at his heart, rough-hewed it as he could, and flung it at his adversary, without stopping to polish it. But when the wild work was done, and a great ruin had been made in England, when that "foreign prelate" was gone, and his bishops had been cast down from their thrones, men looked on the dreary waste which they had caused, and asked who was to take his place. Alas! one had already stepped into it, and the figure "the likeness of a kingly crown had on," and theologians must take it as a mighty fact, and do what they could with it. And then it was that there arose in the bosom of the Church of England two discordant elements, which have struggled and fought till they have well-nigh riven her to pieces. The one was the principle of Church-authority, the other the principle of unalloyed private judgment. Of course, as in all false systems, every principle, even though right and true in itself, becomes convicted of unreality; and here the love of authority, the desire of the tired mind to fold its wings and to be at peace by submission to some power coming from God, only exhibited itself in unreal shapes because it had no object to fix upon. It is like idolatry, which is only one form of the religious life of man, feeding on the worship of wood and stone, because its own true God is lost. So that men in the Church of England looked round for something which had a semblance of God in it, and fixed upon episcopacy. On the other hand, strange to say, and it is a fact which has never been sufficiently dwelt upon, if you are to look for Catholic principles on the freedom of the Church and its independence of the State, you will not find them in the High-Church party, but in the very opposite. The very apostle of Erastianism, the doctor and teacher who threw it into its English shape, was not Cartwright, but Hooker. The Puritans represented the antagonist principle. They were the confessors of the

reformed Church. They had come, in their exile on the continent, into dangerous contact with the spirit of Geneva; after the extempore prayers, the outpourings of the Spirit, and the burning sermons of the continental reformers, the English liturgy appeared cold and tame. It was then, amid the little band of exiles at Frankfort, that there first came together face to face the two discordant spirits, the Anglican reformation and the foreign one. And when the decorous surplice appeared,* and the decent and orderly form of common prayer, they stared upon it, these men of Geneva, as the wild animals of the forest cluster around some tame creature which has escaped from the habitations of men. When the exiles reappeared in England, they took the side which might have been expected of them. The young and energetic life-blood in the heart of Puritanism was not to flow in a cold current at the bidding of the State. "It is not now, tell the Church," says one of their writers; "but it is tell my Lord's Grace, Primate and Metropolitan of all England." It is not supposed that men who had flung down the authority of Rome should quietly submit to the jurisdiction of the Crown; they therefore held the utter independence of the two powers, of the Church and the State.

On the other hand, that which may be called the Catholicising party in the Church of England had to form its view of the relations between the ecclesiastical and the civil power. It, too, had to form its theory; and now let us look at it, not as it exists in the statute-book, but in the shape of a dogma issuing from the mind of theologians. The grave and thoughtful Hooker elaborated it in his study, and it is clear and unmistakeable enough. He held the absolute identity of Church and State, considered as a society; they differed, but only as different functions of one and the same body. "The truth is, that the Church and the Commonwealth are names which import things really different; but these things are accident, and such accidents as may and should always dwell lovingly together in one subject..... When we oppose the Church, therefore, and the Commonwealth in a Christian society, we mean by the Commonwealth that society with relation unto all the public affairs thereof, only the matter of true religion excepted: by the Church, the same society with only reference to the matter of true religion, without any other affairs besides."† He does not shrink from all the deductions to be drawn from such a theory: the head of this society, that is, the king, rules over both its operations. He judges of course according to ecclesiastical law; if the cause concerns the

* Vide History of Frankfort Troubles.

† Eccl. Pol. b. viii.

Church, he does not commit it to the secular courts, he keeps the two separate ; but still he judges, and what is more, if he offend, there is a tribunal over him, but it is that of Heaven ; "on earth he is not accountable to any. . . . It cannot stand with the nature of such sovereign regiment that any subject should have power to exercise on kings so highly authorised the greatest censure of excommunication."*

But we must hasten on, for we have still two centuries before us ; and we must trace this new phenomenon which has arisen in the world, as a natural philosopher watches the changes of shape and colour in some chemical substance in his crucible. It may be said that Hooker's theory was but the mark of a transition state. As, however, it went on it became broader and clearer. It was tested by coming into contact both with the Puritans and the Roman divines. It was heard of in the halls of the Universities of Spain as well as in the Savoy Conference ; and, strange as it may appear to appeal to a Catholic divine, we may at least trust to Suarez for seeing where the gist of a question lies. He makes the Anglican heresy to consist, not in all the errors common to it with the Protestants of the continent, but in holding "that spiritual power is not a separate one from the temporal authority, but is annexed to the sceptre of the king."† King James and his divines might in vain protest that the State did not arrogate to itself the power of the keys ; it certainly claimed authority to direct ecclesiastics in the exercise of that power. Suarez here even becomes energetic and eloquent, and wishes he could tell King James to his face in the palace of Whitehall,‡ that, in order to exercise the powers which Christ had given his Church, her jurisdiction must be separate from that of the State. If the State in England did not touch the very keys of heaven, it at least seized the hand that held them, and so wielded them at its pleasure. The very passage of Bishop Andrewes§ — he, too, a divine of the Catholicising school—adduced to shew the freedom of the Church of England, has stamped upon it the same theory as we drew out from Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*. That exterior government which he claims for the king is neither more nor less than the wielding of all those

* Eccl. Pol. b. ix. He adds, "according to the platform of Reformed discipline ;" but this makes no difference to the question, as he had just denied that St. Ambrose and Babylas Bishop of Antioch had judicial authority to excommunicate Theodosius and Philip, emperors of Rome.

† Suarez, Def. Fid. Cat. 3, 7.

‡ Lib. 3, c. 30.

§ Mr. Irons' Pamphlet, p. 36.

powers by which the Church has external rule over her members, and which involve and spring out of her authority over the soul; just as in this very Gorham case, the judgment upon the fitness of the individual for a living depends upon the previous question whether his doctrine be heresy.

This view, embodied in Bishop Andrewes, that the royal supremacy did not trench on the power of the keys, because it confined itself to matters of external jurisdiction, did not deceive the Puritans any more than it blinded Suarez. It is the characteristic of all antagonistic principles which wage war with each other in England, that they are not in the condition of mere abstractions; they become most fearfully concrete. And never did dogma come out into more wonderful distinctness than that same High-Church theory which was lucubration in the study of Hooker's quiet parsonage. It went through the Council-chamber and the Convocation-hall; it coerced the Puritans in the Star Chamber; and then it came forth from thence to shed its blood on the scaffold, and to shew how earnest was its belief by dying for it. The theory had its martyrs, and one may fairly expect to see it in its full development in their writings. Archbishop Laud died in defence of the divine right of episcopacy and of a high theory of the sacraments. Yet it is nevertheless true, that if you would look for the defenders of the freedom of the spiritual power, you must seek them in the ranks of Cromwell's Ironsides; and when that wondrous army stood the charge of Rupert's Cavaliers, the sturdy bosoms, on which the gallant mass which burst upon them was shivered and dispersed, were on fire with an enthusiastic love of religious freedom and a hatred of Erastianism. As for the Church and monarchy, they sank and they swam together: the body and its head both perished in the waves of civil discord. And this was not more clearly marked in the practical result of the contest, than in the *doctrines* of the school of Laud. The Archbishop himself, in a speech which Heylin calls long and elaborate, delivered in a judicial capacity against the Presbyterian discipline, declares, "that from the time of the Apostles to the days of Calvin, the government of the Church was by bishops, lay elders being never heard of; which claim by divine right derogateth not from the king either in right or power, in regard they exercised not any jurisdiction in the king's dominions but with his license for so doing."* In the Laudian Church, the king was really an integral portion of the Church hierarchy; the framing of liturgies, and the providing for the giving of communion under both

* Life of Laud, book iv. p. 315.

kinds, with various other acts of that nature, belong to him in such a sense that "the king, advising with his bishops and other churchmen (*though not in a synodical way*), may cause the same to be revised and revived; and either commend them to the Church by his sole authority, or else impose them on the people, under certain penalties, by his power in parliament."* Add to this, that the source of jurisdiction, in the case of excommunication and of inflicting ecclesiastical censures, is distinctly placed in the royal supremacy by the canons of 1640, drawn up by Laud, and accepted by convocation.† The theory had but one step further to go, that is, to deny that kings might be excommunicated; and this step was deliberately taken by the cleverest writer of that school of theology, Jeremy Taylor. In the *Ductor Dubitantium*, published but a short time before his death, he argues at length against the notion that kings can be excommunicated; because excommunication being "an act of external jurisdiction, it derives from kings, and therefore they are not under it, but over it; for no coercion in the hands of men ought to touch those who are reserved only for the judgment of God." Even "the refusing of the holy communion is to be only by admonition and caution; if, after this, the prince will be communicated, the bishop hath nothing else to do but to pray and weep, and willingly to minister." In no place is there to be found so clear a declaration that the Church "hath no proper coercion by divine right, but all its ministries and compulsions about the external is the gift and leave of princes."‡

This work of Jeremy Taylor's brings us well over into the Restoration, as it was published in the reign of Charles II. The Church of England rose from its ashes after the civil wars externally the same as when it was ruined with the monarchy; yet a change had come over her, whose results even now remain. It is hardly possible to recognise any identity between the Church of Queen Anne and the same body in the time of Laud. Instead of the fierce and earnest character, which fought for dogma even in the battle-field, so that the name of the Church was mingled in the war-cries of Edgehill and Naseby, a profound indifference to doctrine, as such, came over the nation, and even a large portion of the clergy. The Establishment learned to make a profession of toleration, so that it is hard to realise that she could ever have

* Life of Laud, book iv. p. 309.

† "Excommunication and a suspension of two years for the first offence, and deprivation for the second, to be inflicted by his majesty's commissioners for causes ecclesiastical."—*Life of Laud*, book iv.

‡ Duct. Dub. 3, c. 4, 7.

been the untamed panther in Dryden's graphic poem. Yet, after all, she is the same, because this new spirit which has come over her is only another and a far more natural phase of the same theory of regal supremacy. The union of a dogmatic spirit and of high sacramental doctrines with the hierarchical position of the king in Laud's system was most unreal; if the Church be the depository of divine truth, how can it have a king for its head? if it possess wondrous and mysterious powers of imparting grace, how can it be trammelled in the exercise of them by the jurisdiction of the State? Accordingly, there had been growing up silently but surely a set of men who could not believe that creeds, manifestly imposed by the State, could possibly be the divine exposition of the Christian religion. The school of Laud, out of love for dogma, had transfused the regal power which imposed it into something divine; the latitudinarians, for so they were called, looked on the regal power as a thing of earth, and so treated as earthly the doctrines which emanated from it. This new school took up into itself all the thoughtful intellect of the nation. There is no doubt that the talent of England was on the side of the opponents of Charles I. Besides the fierce and enthusiastic Puritan, there was many a vigorous mind in the republican ranks, religious in its way, but of a religion utterly different from the Praise-God-Barebones, who won the day for Cromwell. Milton's curling locks and face instinct with poetry had but little to do with the crop-eared and sullen Roundhead; and he was a philosophic Christian, with but a very slight reverence for dogma. Selden's was a mind cast in the same mould, and a fitting ancestor for a latitudinarian school. Again, there were men in the halls of Cambridge who took no part in the fearful struggle, and who probably were the immediate parents of the opinions to which we point. It is seldom, perhaps, that the rise of a theory can be traced so clearly home to its source; the busy and the stirring Burnet, who had so much to do with the first triumph of it, and was its apostle, so distinctly tells us when it rose.* Cudworth had drank from the well of Platonism a species of Christianity, which tolerated differences in doctrine far more than Laud would have allowed; and the author of the "Song of the Soul" was not a man to allow his intellect to be fettered by the narrow circle of the Thirty-nine Articles. It is true that they all signed them, as well as Laud and Jeremy Taylor; but a practical man, like Burnet, drew from the fact this inference, that the Anglican symbol was but an external sign of union; that is, a document which all men were to subscribe, but might think about what

* History of his own Times, in ann. 1661.

they pleased. It is not wonderful if this theory about the Thirty-nine Articles was extended to all creeds; and if disputes about dogma began to be looked upon as arguments about words. Every one knows what a share Burnet had in the Revolution of 1688. With William of Orange, latitudinarianism triumphed in England; it ascended the throne of Canterbury with Tillotson; and we may judge of its progress when, on an occasion of a new opinion which had arisen on the doctrine of the holy Trinity, involving the most deadly heresy, the bishops moved the king to silence the dispute by hindering the use of new terms and explanations in such matters.*

And now that we have got thus far, let us pause and see if we have not brought the theory of nationality down to its legitimate results, just as we see them about us in the present day. The Anglican Church has historically divided itself into two parties, the school of Laud and the latitudinarian, each of which, in different ways, is the result of the theory of nationality. Let us look about us, and see the position of parties, as they have been called out by the case of Mr. Gorham. As for us, we can stop and look calmly on the strife, and judge of it dispassionately; but in those wild and tossing waves, on the shore of which we Catholics are calmly walking, there are human souls struggling for life to get to land. It may not, therefore, have been in vain, by an appeal to history, to shew them, of whatever party they be, that they are equally bound to the regal supremacy. The two parties have now been called into active opposition, the latitudinarian State, and the school which, under various denominations, has been considered identical with that of Laud. The State, of course, stands firm in its prerogative, and is avowedly Erastian, as it ever was; while churchmen have become alarmed at the royal supremacy, now that it has decided in favour of heresy, and they repudiate it. They deny the authority of the tribunal which has condemned them, on the ground that the State has no power over the Church. Have they a right to do so? This authority of the State has existed from the very first, since ever the Anglican Establishment existed. It marks it off, as we have shewn, from former ages; it constituted it, and ever since it has remained within it, not as an usurpation, but as an acknowledged thing. It has not lain dormant in the statute-book, but has been defended as a doctrine by divines of every school, except the Puritan, and, above all, by the theologians whom they have ever upheld as their own legitimate ancestors. The Church of England, at the Reformation, flung down the gaunt-

* *History of his own Times*, in ann. 1698.

let, and undertook to defend the royal supremacy against all comers, Protestant or Catholic. Have we not, then, every right to say, that it is the doctrine of the Anglican Church? What possible greater proof could be given that it believes in any given doctrine? How do they know that we Catholics believe in a definite doctrine of purgatory, save that in writers of every school a certain clear dogma is to be found? There are numerous matters of opinion as to how fire can affect a spirit, when and how the stains of sin are purged away; but one thing is certain, that it is the Catholic doctrine that there is a purgatorial state; and the proof of it is, that all theologians, Franciscan, Dominican, or Jesuit, take it for granted. Now, throughout the three hundred years of the existence of the Anglican Church, the royal supremacy has been the dogma which all have agreed in, from Hooker down to the present day, save the more zealous of the Puritans. They may say that there is a gap in our catena; they may point to the non-jurors. Now, first of all, Sancroft and Ken were so far from going out on the ground of the independence of the Church, that, on the contrary, they left the Church of England because they would not take the oaths to a new king. They are the witnesses and the confessors of the doctrine of passive obedience to kings, not of resistance to regal supremacy. Next, we fully grant that Leslie's theory of Church and State is not by any means so Erastian as that of Laud; but Leslie was cast out of the bosom of the Church of England, he no more belonged to her than he did to the Church of Rome. What he thought of her may be drawn from the bitter sarcasms of his *Regale and Pontificate*.* And if the gap requires filling up, it is easy to find Wake, an Archbishop of Canterbury, whose name has figured in many a catena of the Tracts for the Times, asserting that the power of the prince reaches "not only in matters of discipline, but in matters of faith too;"† and that the prince may confirm or rescind the decisions of a synod, as he pleases, even in matters of faith.

After all, it is a dangerous thing to play with creeds and with oaths. The thrice-subscribed Thirty-nine Articles mean something; every clergyman of the Church of England has laid his hand upon his heart and sworn before God on the Gospels that he believes in the royal supremacy. The concurrent voice of writers of every school for three hundred years has interpreted that supremacy to mean that the king is the source of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The Gorham case is only an instance of the exercise of this royal prerogative; and if the Privy Council has decided upon a dogma in com-

* Preface, p. 258.

† Works of Leslie, *Regale and Pont.* p. 367.

manding a clergyman to be instituted in a living, it is only another proof that this external jurisdiction cannot be really separated from the power of deciding matters of faith. When they took their oath to maintain the royal supremacy, it was no abstraction, but a reality, defined by the practice and the doctrine of three centuries, which they swore to uphold. Let them beware; for it is the very essence of latitudinarianism to subscribe articles of faith and to look upon them as mere words, as formularies not expressive of divine truth, but of opinions. Oh, that principle of nationality is the curse of God upon a land! No national Church can possibly contain within itself an authoritative standard of religion. Truth is not a matter of geography; it does not run in blood; and when Jesus Christ left Christianity upon earth, He did not intend that each nation should have its own form of his religion. And so it leads infallibly to State supremacy; and then to latitudinarianism. First, the State imposes articles of faith, then men subscribe them; it produces outward uniformity, but below this external show of universal subscription there lurks a black abyss of universal latitude of opinion, for no man can dream for a moment that the State can really be a standard of truth, or an exponent of faith, so that they end in believing what they will. Ay, and below that there is a deeper depth, the gulf of Infidelity. England has a school of Deism peculiar to itself; and it can be shewn historically that it arose out of this principle of nationality in religion. It is but too obvious a conclusion that the varying forms of Christianity are only so many developments of national character, if each country has a complete power within itself to be the standard of religion. It is a wonderful thing to see Hooker's principles appear in Hobbes, but if any one will take the trouble to compare the following passage with the eighth book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, the identity will strike him at once:—"The Commonwealth of Christian men and the Church of the same are altogether the same thing, called by two names for two reasons. For the matter of the Church and of the Commonwealth is the same, namely, the same Christian men." Again: "The Church is the same thing with the Commonwealth, because it consisteth of men united in one person, their sovereign." From this doctrine the philosopher of Malmesbury drew the conclusion that Christianity was only the religion of the State, and therefore a mere human creation instead of a divine revelation. And when the keen and sarcastic mind of Shaftesbury came in contact with the Anglican Establishment, he laughed to scorn the notion that the mighty mys-

teries of religion could emanate from a national Church, where "the dogmas of religion are to be determined by those to whom the State has assigned the guardianship and promulgation of the divine oracles."* The same thing appears in Lord Bolingbroke; he looked around him upon the religion of England, and declared "that the gates of hell had actually prevailed against the Church, for there was no standard of genuine Christianity, since it depended upon nothing but the force of education and the civil and ecclesiastical power."† It is therefore no mere theory to assert that English Deism sprang out of the notion of a national Church.

It is a fearful thing to meddle with the Church of God. Who could have prophesied that the taking away of that "foreign bishop," with his jurisdiction over causes ecclesiastical, should let out upon England such a deluge of infidelity? And yet, after all, the most terrible effect of this nationality is to be found among those who would fain be Catholics without the see of St. Peter. It is all very well to exclaim against royal supremacy; but a final appeal you must have somewhere, and we defy you to frame one out of a national Church. Look around you; supposing that Queen Victoria abdicated her prerogative, and formally surrendered her title of Head of the Church, still a tribunal you must have to decide points of faith, and where is it to be found? You have no materials for it; let the bishops assemble synodically as freely as you will, could the utmost stretch of faith believe for a single moment that you could get a decision which you would trust in any one point of doctrine? It is all very well to say, with a writer in the *Guardian* before referred to, that "the *animus* of Henry the Eighth's statute is to declare the sufficiency of the spirituality, the English Church, to determine all causes within itself." Who ever gave it that power? When did Christ ever say that the spirituality of England was the final court of appeal in a dogmatic decision? And when that miserable spiritual power is reduced to a shadow by depending on the State, so that its best defenders allow it to be a lawful if not the best possible state of things, that an earthly king should wield the laws of the Church in spiritual matters, we want no other proof of the deep Erastianism of the Establishment. Dr. Pusey's letter is the last link of our catena of High-Church divines holding Erastian principles. He is totally unconscious that giving the king power to judge on ecclesiastical matters, according to ecclesiastical law, is giving him the full exercise of that jurisdiction which St. Thomas shed his blood to secure to the Church.

* *Characteristics* ap. Leland, vol. i. lib. 5. † Leland, vol. ii. *Reflections*.

But there is another species of jurisdiction which Henry VIII., in the madness of his tyranny, never dared to assume, which Queen Elizabeth, after having made havoc with every law of the Church of God, never ventured to lay a finger upon, either directly or indirectly, and that is, power over souls in the sacrament of penance. It has been reserved for the present age to find men who can make themselves the source of jurisdiction, not only *in foro externo*, but also in the tribunal of confession itself. There must be a deep spiritual illusion in the mind of an Anglican clergyman, who, in the state to which controversy has advanced at present, when all plea of invincible ignorance is utterly gone, can set himself to absolve a sinner. Who gave him authority over that poor soul who is kneeling at his feet? He did not get it from his ordination, were it ever so valid; for the sacrament of orders gives no jurisdiction, it only gives grace. Christ has given to his Church power over souls, and to her alone, so that every act which implies that power must come from her; and she gives it quite apart from ordination. Now, neither God nor God's Church, no, nor the Anglican Establishment, has conferred authority to hear confessions on any one of the English clergy. For a man to assume it to himself is an unheard-of thing. We cannot enter into the state of mind of the man who, without authority from heaven or earth, confers upon himself an universal jurisdiction. Who would dare, without power from God's Church, to sit down and pry into the recesses of a tortured conscience, and while the poor child of sin writhes like a worm at his feet, to force from her reluctant lips what she dares not avow to herself without agony? And after all, when the miserable tale is told, and the heart adequately torn, she may go away with the certainty that, granting that her confessor had the grace of orders as clearly as Arius and Eutychius undoubtedly had, her heavy burden is still there; she rises up unshriven, without a single sin, mortal or venial, washed away, because he has no jurisdiction. Confession is conceivable, it is done every day where the system is made for it, where the priest has had his faculties from the Church of God; but in a society which by no one act has ever given a hint of conferring such a power, to arrogate to oneself an œcumenical power of hearing confessions all over the world is very like sitting in the house of God as God. And there is another power closely connected with it, which we would notice before we have done. If there be any one of his sacred functions which a Catholic priest shrinks from exercising without a call from God, it is that of direction. When he knows the wondrous and often-

times the fearful dealings of God's Spirit with a soul, when he has learned how the counter-workings of the prince of evil come across and often simulate the operations of the Holy Ghost, he feels that he is the organ of things utterly beyond him; he is tremblingly jealous of himself; so that if he be conscious that a natural feeling, though utterly unconnected with sin, may blind or obscure his vision, he turns the soul away to the guidance of another, though it sit nearest to his heart, as a child to that of its mother. And yet these are the powers which, without vocation, without a shadow of training, men take upon themselves. What can they do but utterly spoil and blast the souls which come under them? God help them! May Mary, in her sweet month of May, obtain for them the grace, which their presumption does not deserve, of coming like children to ask for absolution at the feet of the Church of St. Anselm and St. Thomas.

SHORT NOTICES.

WE have been requested by an eminent Prelate to remind our readers of the singular benefits of a devotion as yet too little esteemed among English Catholics; we mean, the devotion to our Lady as practised by the confraternity of the Scapular. The "Month of Mary" is a fitting season for a consideration of the benefits attached to this devotion, and we take the opportunity of recommending a little book on *Devotion to our Lady of Mount Carmel* (Richardson and Son), revised by a Prelate of the Carmelite order, which may be relied on as a full and correct history of the privileges possessed by those Catholics who wear the Scapular. In one sense, it may be called a peculiarly English devotion, its origin having been a revelation made at Cambridge, in the twelfth century, to St. Simon Stock, an Englishman. There are few devout practices which have received so abundant a supply of privileges from the Holy See, or been sanctioned by more remarkable miracles; while the blessing to the departed soul declared by the Sabbatine Bull to be the subject of an allowable pious belief, is such as is to be sought for in no other confraternity or holy exercise. We cannot too earnestly commend the subject to the attention of those who are yet unacquainted with it.

The Second Annual Report of the Catholic Poor-School Committee is, we suspect, the most business-like and satisfactory publication of its kind which for many a year has issued from the English Catholic body. It exhibits an increase in the pecuniary means of the Committee; and, what is still more hopeful, it shews

that a practical, energetic, and enlightened movement is in progress in the great work of the education of our poor. We sincerely congratulate the Committee and their indefatigable Secretary on being *in a position* to put forth such a report, in the place of the preposterous puffs and lists of illustrious "patrons" on which Catholic affairs have too often depended. We observe that the only places where local committees have yet been formed are in Yorkshire, Lancashire, and the Middlesex side of London. We venture to express a hope that the third Report will tell a different tale.

How vast is the importance of adopting every means for the furthering the Christian education of the young of every class, we are again painfully reminded by the Right Rev. Dr. Ullathorne's *Remarks on the proposed Education Bill* (Burns and Lambert). Mr. Fox, M.P. for Oldham, as most of our readers are aware, has introduced into Parliament a Bill for establishing purely secular schools in every parish in England and Wales, whensoever *they appear to the Government Inspectors to be required*. These schools are to be supported by a compulsory rate on the inhabitants; and the education is to exclude (professedly) all religious teaching, while "sufficient time is to be allowed to each pupil for receiving religious instruction under the direction of its parents." In other words, this is the Irish Colleges scheme adapted for the *people* of England. From the moment we read the debate on Mr. Fox's motion for leave to bring in this Bill, we were filled with alarms. Non-religious education being, in fact, an impossibility, it was evident at the first glance that these schools must be a universal *Propaganda* for Socinianism (for Deism and Atheism are out of fashion), accompanied by that laxity of morals which is the inevitable accompaniment of such a system. At the same time, backed by Government influence and supported by Government funds, they would present secular advantages of the most fatally ensnaring power, and absorb to themselves no small portion of the present scholars of more Christian-like seminaries. Dr. Ullathorne's pamphlet is a masterly dissection of the whole nature of the scheme, and cannot be too strongly recommended to men of every creed, who believe that God has given a real revelation of his will to mankind.

The *Dublin Review* for April contains several good articles, and one of unusual interest. It is a biographical sketch of the late Rev. Thomas Harris, who for a short time was attached to the Bavarian Chapel, London, and who died about a year ago. Mr. Harris was born a Dissenter; and though, from his earliest years, he had strong inclinations to enter the Catholic Church, and adopted Catholic practices, he ultimately became an Independent minister, and as such preached and superintended a congregation in Lincolnshire for fourteen years. At length some of his people begged him to resign; and without hesitation he acceded to their wishes. Still he could not make up his mind to become a Catholic, till the decision on the

stone-altar case determined him against a nascent idea of entering the Establishment. He then introduced himself to some of the priests in London, and was received into the Church by the Rev. E. Hearn, on Whitsunday, 1846. A year and a half afterwards he received minor orders, and ultimately was made priest. His sacerdotal life was short indeed; but it left a sweet-smelling odour behind it, as fragrant and refreshing to the few who had the happiness of knowing him as the previous circumstances of his life were rare. The article before us gives many interesting details of his history, with extracts from his papers. We commend the study of Mr. Harris's life, while he was still a Dissenter, to those High-Church Anglicans who imagine that *wherever* such "signs of life" are found, *there* must necessarily be a branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ. They should also read and ponder on the searching dissection of the position of Anglicanism under the Gorham judgment with which this number of the *Dublin* concludes. The review of "Newman's Discourses" is also well worthy their serious attention, though not specially intended for non-Catholic readers.

Dr. Wiseman's sermon on the Gorham case, called *The Final Appeal in matters of Faith* (Richardson), contrasts the practical working of the theory of Anglican Churchmanship with the living constitution of the Catholic Church. It powerfully exposes the hollowness and deadness of that system which, with such pretensions, can lead to such results.

The flood of pamphlets on the same case continues without intermission. The most curious, in some respects, is *A Few Words on the Spirit in which Men are meeting the present Crisis in the Church*, by the Rev. E. Monro (Parker). Notwithstanding our respect for Mr. Monro, as a hard-working man, who practises what he preaches, we cannot speak of his "Few Words" as otherwise than eminently discreditable to him, both morally and intellectually. It is difficult to believe that he has honestly contemplated the results of his own statements, or that a man who can so bitterly expose the humbug of Puseyism can really believe, as he professes, in its divine origin. He spends many pages in telling us that the Puseyite clergy are frequently mere reproductions, under a High-Church garb, of the Exeter Hall spouters; that they neglect their schools, have little intercourse with their people, care little for prayer and the sacraments, and even do not *look* like men of God! The recent meeting at Willis's Rooms he speaks of with absolute disgust, and says that the clerical speeches there delivered were exhibitions of undisciplined oratory. Then, with the same breath, he extols the wondrous revival of apostolic sanctity and doctrine which now distinguishes the Establishment; and, under this pretence, positively refuses to look the question of its Catholicity in the face, telling Protestants to beware of treating the subject as a matter of purely intellectual argument. What, let us ask Mr. Monro, does he mean by an argument

which is not intellectual? *We* know what he means, though he blinks the truth himself. He means that which is no argument at all, but a determination to hold fast to one's position, or one's connexion, or one's income, *at all risks*, on the ground of an enthusiastic *feeling* in its favour. We are far enough from imputing a sordid love of lucre to Mr. Monro; but we cannot help suggesting to him that there is a certain love of influence, of professional power, of the homage and respect of good men and kind friends, which is as ensnaring to minds of a nobler cast as the passion for pelf is to the vulgar herd. Let Mr. Monro beware of living and dying one of the ten thousand petty anti-popes who have usurped the vicarages and rectories of once Catholic England. How *can* he be true to himself, when he compares what he calls the "carnal weapons" with which St. Athanasius, St. Ambrose, St. Anselm, and St. Thomas fought the fight of the Church, with the protests of Anglican clergymen, of whom he says, "*We inspire no terror, create no alarm, for the light of saintliness is not reflected in face, or tone, or manner, and in its place have simply crept the shallow expressions of men of the world.*" Mr. Monro's remarks on the past history and present claims of the Church of Rome shew that he has neither studied nor understands the subject. But what can be looked for from one who has literally written and *printed* such sentences as the following? "The English Church (*i.e.* the Protestant Establishment) may have produced few saints; I *imagine*, however, she has produced many, *but very much hidden in the retirement of private life.* The names of Wilson, Ken, Andrewes, and many more, *are household names among our very poor* (add, at Harrow-Weald). There has been *certainly* a salt *somewhere* in our English society!" Again, he says: "We have every reason to believe that the Church (*i.e.* the universal Church) will have been broken up before the end of all things." Does Mr. Monro believe *any thing*?

Mr. Dodsworth has published a shrewd pamphlet, *The Gorham Case briefly considered* (Pickering), and an Easter Sermon, *Holy Baptism* (Masters). The former fastens, ruthlessly and irresistibly, the Gorham judgment upon the neck of the Establishment; the latter says that "the blow, if not averted, will destroy *ITS LIFE.*" The capitals are Mr. Dodsworth's. Is he prepared to carry out his conclusions into practice? We trust and hope so.

The Bishop of Exeter's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury is a singularly able exposure of the case of his opponent, as far as it suits Dr. Philpotts' views to expose it. It ends with a declaration that he will hold no communion with any one who takes any part in instituting Mr. Gorham to his living. But what this threat *means* nobody knows. Does Dr. Philpotts know himself?

An "Anglican Layman" has written an acute pamphlet, *The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and the Petition for a Church*

Tribunal in lieu of it (Pickering). If the writer is not a lawyer, he has a strong, legal head; and he brings out, with great clearness, the absurdity of the notion that the Church of England, having entered into a compact with the State, and constituted the sovereign supreme, should now claim to be the sole interpreter of the extent of that compact. Other kindred fallacies he exposes with equal decision. At p. 14 he speaks of the necessity of a *faith* for those who "having children, have the souls of others dependent upon them." Has it never struck him that he has a soul of his own also?

Mr. Maskell's Second Letter on *The Want of Dogmatic Teaching in the Reformed English Church* (Pickering) is the most crushing exposure of the hollowness of the claims of the Establishment that we have yet seen proceeding from any but a Catholic pen. The facts Mr. Maskell mentions about the "Dublin articles" are new to us; and if he is correct in what he says upon them, they are enough to decide the whole Gorham and Exeter case, without five minutes' additional discussion. Yet nobody has ever urged their bearings, or mentioned their existence, during the controversy. Truly the Establishment knows no more about herself than she knows about the Church of Rome.

The Speech of Edward Badeley, Esq., before the Privy Council, with an Introduction (Murray), now published in a corrected form, may be said to possess considerable historical value. We still desiderate Mr. Turner's argument in a similarly authenticated shape, to make the case complete (and this we hope that learned advocate will be prevailed upon to supply), but on the High-Church side nothing remains to be desired: Mr. Badeley has in a manner exhausted the subject. The radical fault in his argument, to our minds, is, a two-fold assumption. Not only does he take it for granted, in the face of the *general* fact of the Reformation, that the Church of England, because it retained certain old orthodox formularies, and in the matter of Baptism at least an orthodox ritual, retained *therefore* the old Catholic doctrine; but, notwithstanding the *specific* fact that the Articles of 1536 respecting the Sacraments in general and Baptism in particular underwent considerable alteration in 1552, he asserts that no alteration was intended in the doctrine itself or in its stringency as a dogma of the faith. This is a mere begging of the question. The Reformation was a change, a doctrinal change; the original words of the Article were changed, they were made more indefinite, more equivocal, and yet we are to hold without proof that no corresponding *doctrinal* change was intended! This seems to us to be the one fatal flaw in the argument of the speech and of the introduction, in which Mr. Badeley endeavours to fasten on the judges the charge of inconsistency and of unlawyer-like conduct.

It is a question of the meaning of formularies. The judges set out by saying, that in ascertaining the true meaning of the language employed, they must be guided by the consideration of such external

or historical facts as they may find necessary to enable them to understand the subject-matter to which the instruments relate. They say also, that if there be any doctrine on which the Articles are silent or ambiguously expressed, they must suppose that it was intended to leave that doctrine to private judgment, unless the rubrics and formularies clearly and distinctly decide it. Well, in the opinion of the judges, on the doctrine of Baptism the Articles are ambiguously expressed, and the rubrics and formularies do not clearly and distinctly decide it; and therefore they have recourse to external and historical facts. Surely there is no inconsistency here. Mr. Badeley complains likewise of the injustice of such a mode of proceeding. But why? Only because he differs in opinion from the judges; for to his mind the rubrics and formularies are clear and distinct, and tell in his favour, which is a mere *petitio principii*. He says they ought to have ascertained what the doctrine was before and *at the period of the Reformation*; the judges conceive, and very rightly as it seems to us, that their office was rather to decide what was the doctrine of the Church as reformed; and this they do by inquiring into "the different opinions as to the sacrament of Baptism held by different promoters of the Reformation," and by instituting a comparison between the Articles of 1536 and those of 1562.

For our parts, we need hardly say we believe the decision to be most fair, and the only one that could be arrived at consistently with the facts of the case. We have always held Mr. Maskell's view to be the true one, that the reformed English Church, if it be exact to speak of such a body as a being with a mind and a meaning, *intended* to leave the doctrine of Baptism, like almost every other portion of the Christian belief, an open question. This Mr. Badeley does not at present see; but one thing, and that after all of far more importance practically, he does see, and he declares his convictions in no mistakeable terms. "It is idle to say," these are his words, "that this judgment is extraneous to the Church. . . . It is impossible to contend that the Church of England has not allowed and assented to this tribunal. . . . And can this be a thing of no moment? Can the Church wait and do nothing with the poison of heresy actually in its veins? . . . Surely not: *if it be** a Church, it must shew its power; *if it be* 'the pillar and ground of the truth,' it must assert the true doctrine and denounce the false; and if it fails to do this *promptly, resolutely, and effectually*, who will deem it a Church at all? . . . The time is now arrived, when the Church of England must raise its voice, or be silenced for ever."

It will be a satisfaction to our readers to know that on the subject of "prevenient grace," and, what concerns us nearest, *adult baptism* in the "Roman" Church—on both which points the most unworthy language was put into his mouth by the newspaper reporters, even those of his own party—Mr. Badeley's statements are perfectly unexceptionable. Indeed, the answers given *impromptu* to

* The italics throughout are in the original.

questions put by members of the Judicial Committee or their assessors, are remarkable for their accuracy and precision.

This contest, indeed, continues every day to develope fresh extraordinary phenomena. Works that used to be written when the Rubicon was passed, are now put forth on the other side the line. Mr. Allies, in a most masterly pamphlet, *The Royal Supremacy viewed in reference to the two Spiritual Powers of Order and Jurisdiction* (Pickering), distinguished, in favourable contrast with his former publications, by clear and conclusive reasoning, and language vigorous and precise, *proves* that the Church of England has possessed no jurisdiction from Parker's consecration downwards, and even insinuates a doubt as to the validity of her orders. We cannot reconcile his present statements as to the oneness and visibility of the Church with the theories even recently propounded by him; but let this pass: minds open to conviction make rapid progress in times like these. It is wonderful how the Church's battles are being fought by those who are still, in position at least, rebels against her authority. Thousands who will not listen when she speaks, and who try to ignore her very existence, are now forced to hear, if not to answer. Catholics have no need to take part in this controversy, except by their prayers, and in this kind of warfare they may achieve great victories.

If any of our readers doubt the prevalence of what we can call by no other name than theological suicide, let him listen to *A Voice from the North* (Masters). Catholics, and especially converts, are accused of saying strong things against the established religion; but the strongest word they have uttered is mildness itself, compared with the stern denunciations of this "English Priest." We are far from denying the truth of them, or the power with which they are spoken; and yet it appears to us somewhat odd, that one who is "sure," with a "most certain conviction of heart and head," that "the Church of England" is "the Body of Christ," "the mother of his redeemed soul," should go so far as to say that "an enemy" has "found an abiding place" in her, and, amongst other wicked successes, has "rendered ridiculous, and sometimes *almost blasphemous*, her ceremonies of public worship." The whole production is curious, as shewing what sort of growths Anglo-Catholicism is putting forth under present forcing influences.

Despite, however, the growing tumult, there is one voice that whispers peace, and would fain allay the troubled waters. Whatever the "priests" of the Church may say or do, "the Mother Superior of the Sisters of Mercy of Devonport and Plymouth" (*A Few Words, &c.* Masters) bids the women of England heed them not, but be calm and silent. Truth, heresy, guidance, authority — with such things they have nothing to do. *Silence* is their safeguard. If this really meant that they were not to dogmatise or preach sermons, we should only remark that St. Paul had already given similar advice;

but such meaning is irreconcilable with this lady's own way of proceeding. We have always felt great personal sympathy with her benevolent and religious exertions; but there is something so extremely fearful in this endeavour to stifle the conscientious convictions of those whom she addresses, something so presumptuous, we cannot use a softer term, in the responsibility she has assumed to herself, of acting the part of a *Church* to "these sorrowful and aching hearts," that we look with the deepest apprehension upon that phase of the religious movement at the head of which the writer of this letter has placed herself. Catholics are sometimes thought cold and ungenerous, when they do not at once recognise the presence of supernatural charity in such benevolent enterprises. It is not, however, that they do not regard them with hopeful interest as haply signs of a true love of God, and the means by which his grace is pleased to bring earnest souls into his Church; but they know that they want their proper and solid basis—obedience, submission of the will to a divine authority. Outside the Catholic Church it is impossible to practise supernatural obedience; and without such obedience, humility in its high and evangelical sense cannot exist. Hence it is, that certain practices of self-denial and devotion may externally bear a close resemblance to acts of heroic sanctity, and yet not possess that character; because what constitutes sanctity is not the performance of certain acts, but the possession of the whole complement of Christian graces and virtues in an heroic degree. We are not, therefore, grudging such acts their deserved praise, when we deny the high claim put forward for them, because we know that such claim outside the Church can never be sustained; and if proof were wanting, we need but point to the publication before us.

Its tenor is perplexing in another point of view. In her correspondence with Lord Campbell, Miss Sellon speaks of the late decision as committing her Church to heresy; yet the letter on which we are commenting is written with a view of hiding this fact from "some of the women of the Church of God in England," or at any rate, of leading them to treat it as of no consequence. We make great allowances for singularity and anomaly of position, and desire to draw no unfair conclusion; but we are really puzzled what to think.

Dr. Hook, in his *Letter on the present Crisis* (Murray), takes a common sense, or, as we should rather say, *natural* sense view of the whole matter. "The inference from the late discussion," he says, "is, that ours is the right doctrine; but that those who appear to us to explain it away may still remain in the Church." "It is notorious that they have done so [held preferment] for the last 300 years; and her most gracious Majesty in Council has been pleased to rule that this their liberty shall not be abridged." Of course, he has his fling at Rome, and pronounces her heretical on the doctrine of baptism. He reminds his readers that "some of

the most learned and devoted servants of Christ have regarded the Church of Rome as Antichrist." And "to this opinion," he adds, "the Church of England seems in our homilies to incline." Nay, he informs them, that "some, *even members of the Church of Rome*, have expressed their belief that this is the case." Who these eminent individuals are, who have held this belief in conjunction with Pope Pius's Creed, (which, by the way, he quotes at length,) he does not happen to mention. Dr. Hook estimates other persons' powers by his own, for he is the only person in the world who appears to us capable of so prodigious an intellectual feat.—And these are thy doctors, O United Church of England and Ireland!

We have before us three Catalogues of portions of Mr. Stewart's stock of books in King William Street, Strand, London, which merit the especial attention of theologians and theological students. The first is a *classified Catalogue of Bibles and Works on Biblical Literature* of all ages and creeds, in which the works of Catholic writers hold a very prominent place. It contains nearly 4000 different works and editions, some of them extremely scarce, and many of the first class of commentators and illustrators of the Sacred Scriptures. The second is a Catalogue of *Fathers of the Church and Ecclesiastical Writers to the Fifteenth Century*, arranged in chronological order, a plan very convenient for reference. Considering that this is a bookseller's *bond fide* stock, the collection is wonderfully complete. The list for the thirteenth century, for instance, includes the writings of St. Francis, St. Antony of Padua, Gregory IX., William of Paris, Bishop Grostête, Matthew Paris, Hugo of St. Clare, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, Albertus Magnus, Bar, Durandus, with *many* others. The third Catalogue will be found at the end of our present number, and consists exclusively of Catholic works. The first two can be had by application to Mr. Stewart. On the whole, the collection is probably unique among booksellers, whether in England or on the continent, and deserves examination by every one who is forming or adding to a theological library.

As we are going to press, a new book for the Month of Mary reaches us. *The Graces of Mary* (Burns and Lambert), so far as a glance can ascertain, seems a charming little publication.

RETURN OF THE POPE TO ROME.

THE Pope entered Rome on the 12th of April last. His Holiness was received most enthusiastically, as the letters of General Baraguay d'Hilliers testify. The city was illuminated in the evening, and a day is soon to be fixed on which he will give a solemn benediction from St. Peter's.

DIED,

On the 12th instant, at Cliff Lodge, Southampton, Edward Gilbert Horne, aged 15.
R. I. P.